1 2	UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE BEFORE THE SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE
3	IN re: Docket #AO-F&V-991-A3 FV03-991-01
4	HOPS PRODUCERS FOR WASHINGTON, OREGON, IDAHO AND
5	CALIFORNIA
6	
7	Hearing held on the 15th day of October 2003
8	at 9:00 a.m.
9	Portland, Oregon
10 11	TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS
12	
13	BEFORE: HONORABLE JILL CLIFTON
14 15 16	

1	INDEX	
2		
3		Page
4	Donald Hinman	30
5	Stephen Carpenter	57
6	Arthur DeCelle	132
7	Michael Smith	195
8		
9	INDEX TO EXHIBITS	
10	#1 Hearing Notice	27
11	#2 Cert. of Off. Not.	28
12	#3 Cert. of Mailing	28
13	#4 Cert. Regarding News Release	28
14	#5 Statistical Summary	32
15	#6 Exchange Rate Guide	37
16	#7 Carpenter Stmt.	55
17	#8 Reserved	55
18	#9 K. Desserault Stmt.	55
19	#10 Newhouse Stmt.	55
20	#11 Brulotte Stmt.	55
21	#12 Roy Stmt.	55
22	#13 Gasseling Stmt.	55

1 #14	D. Desserault Stmt.	55
2 #15	Oversupply Document	61
3 #16	Per Capita Beer Consumption	133
4 #17	U.S. Brewer Output	133
5 #18	DeCelle Stmt.	190
6 #19	Minimum Requirements	191

PROCEEDINGS

October 15, 2003

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: This record is being made on Wednesday October 15, 2003 in Portland, The time now is approximately 9:12 in the morning. The purpose of the hearing is to make the record on which a Decision will be made by the Secretary of Agriculture regarding hops produced in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and California. My name is Jill Clifton. I'm a U.S. Administrative Law Judge. I'm assigned to take in the evidence on which the Decision will be made. And I want to acquaint you with the difference between a hearing and a meeting. This is a public hearing. And we're gathering the evidence on which the Decision will be made. So it's very important that we go slowly enough that a good record is made. So if you will, when you speak, identify yourself each time you begin to speak again anew. In a moment, I'll have each of you who expects to participate in the proceeding identify yourself, but because many of us will be using the same mike and we can't identify the speaker merely by which mike is used, I need for you, please, again to state your name each time you speak. And I'll try to remind you of that. I would like each witness -- each person York Stenographic Services, Inc.

34 North George St., York, PA 17401 - (717) 854-0077

who's providing testimony -- and there are only two 1 kinds of evidence, testimony and exhibits -- I would 2 like each witness to testify from the location to my 3 I think -- and each witness will be either placed under oath or affirmation to tell the truth. 5 what makes a difference between someone's statement as a comment or an argument and witness evidence. 7 although it may be somewhat uncomfortable and it may 8 slow things down a little bit for the witnesses to come 9 testify here to my left that's how I'd prefer us to 10 proceed. We also have a microphone at the podium. 11 12 that's now where a witness would provide testimony, but that's where someone who wants to question a witness 13 will have that opportunity. We have proponents of the 14 proposals that are going to be presented here. We have 15 16 opponents of those proposals. Some of those are identified and some of those people are not necessarily 17 identified but wish to be heard and come to the hearing. 18 If you have something to say, then you should do it as a 19 20 witness so that it has weight as evidence. merely want to question the witness who's speaking, you 21 will have an opportunity to do that. I need to have you 22 identify yourself at the time that the other people have 23 finished their question. Then everyone else who has 24 25 questions would have that opportunity as well. York Stenographic Services, Inc.

```
we're scheduled to begin the hearing each day at 8:30 in
        the morning and to conclude at 5:00 in the evening.
 2
        We'll have a lunch break. Normally I have at least one
 3
        break in the morning and at least one break in the
 4
 5
        afternoon in addition to the lunch break.
                                                    It's best if
        the presenter at the portion of the hearing can help us
 6
        gauge when would be a good time to break. So if any of
 7
        you have any special concerns that way there's a
 8
 9
        particular speaker who must be heard now in order to
        catch a plane, please just make me aware of those. And
10
        I'll be happy to announce what the request is and hear
11
        what the others of you think about that request so that
12
        we can schedule in accordance with the convenience of as
13
14
        many of you as possible. I'd like now to do another
        test of the microphones as we go around the room and
15
        hear who you are. If the people in the back cannot
16
        hear, please raise your hand. I'd like to start with
17
        representatives of the United States Government.
18
19
        Deskins, would you identify yourself please?
20
                  MS. DESKINS:
                                Yes. My name is Sharlene
        Deskins. I'm an attorney with the United States
21
        Department of Agriculture, Office of General Counsel.
22
       My office address is 1400 Independence Avenue Southwest,
23
24
       Washington, DC. The zip code is 20250-1417. And I
        represent the Agricultural Marketing Service in this
25
                         York Stenographic Services, Inc.
```

1	case. I would like to point out to everyone, as the
2	Judge has said, that this is a public hearing. It is
3	also formal rule making and we are governed by the rules
4	of practice on this proceeding. Anyone with
5	Agricultural Marketing Service or Office of General
6	Counsel cannot have any ex parte discussions regarding
7	the issues of this hearing. If you have anything that
8	you'd like to say to the government, you do need to say
9	it on the witness stand and that way we can hear what
10	you have to say.
11	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Ms. Deskins,
12	thank you. And would you spell your name for the
13	record.
14	MS. DESKINS: It's first name is spelled
15	S-h-a-r-l-e-n-e. The last name is spelled
16	D-e-s-k-i-n-s.
17	MS. DEC: Good morning. I'm Anne Dec. I work
18	with USDA's Agricultural Marketing Service in the
19	Marketing Order Administration Branch. My office is in
20	Washington, DC.
21	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Ms. Dec, would
22	you spell your names please.
23	MS. DEC: D-e-c.
24	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: And Anne?
25	MS. DEC: A-n-n-e.
	York Stenographic Services, Inc.

1	MS. FINN: Good morning. My name is Kathleen
2	Finn. That's K-a-t-h-l-e-e-n F-i-n-n. I'm a marketing
3	specialist in the U.S. Department of Agriculture
4	Marketing Order Administration Branch in Washington, DC.
5	MR. BROADBENT: Barry Broadbent.
6	B-a-r-r-y B-r-o-a-d-b-e-n-t. I'm a marketing specialist
7	with the Northwest Marketing Field Office for the
8	Marketing Order Administrative Branch of USDA.
9	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: And where are
10	you stationed?
11	MR. BROADBENT: Portland, Oregon.
12	MR. OLSON: My name is Gary Olson. My name
13	is spelled G-a-r-y O-l-s-o-n. I'm the regional manager
14	of the Northwest Marketing Field Office, Agricultural
15	Marketing Service, Fruit and Vegetable Programs here in
16	Portland. My address is 1220 Southwest Third Avenue,
17	Room 385, Portland, Oregon, 97204.
18	DR. HINMAN: My name is Donald Hinman.
19	D-o-n-a-l-d H-i-n-m-a-n. I'm an economist with the
20	Economic Analysis and Program Planning Branch, Fruit and
21	Vegetable Programs, Agricultural Marketing Service, U.S.
22	Department of Agriculture. And my office address is in
23	Washington, DC.
24	MS. RAZICK: I'm Nazima Razick. N-a-z-i-m-a
25	R-a-z-i-c-k. I'm an attorney at the USDA Office of

1 General Counsel in Washington, DC. 2 ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Thank you. Now I believe everyone could hear each of those speakers. 3 4 Is that correct? If you give me a yes from the back of the room. Good. Good. Well, I think our investment of 5 time was well with it. Let's begin with the Proponents 7 Committee table now. 8 MR. MONAHAN: Thank you, Your Honor. My name 9 is Brendan Monahan. I'm an attorney from Yakima, 10 Washington. I represent the Proponents Committee. ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: 11 Would you spell 12 your names for us? MR. MONAHAN: I'm sorry. First name Brendan, 13 B-r-e-n-d-a-n. Last name Monahan, M-o-n-a-h-a-n. 14 MR. K. DESSERAULT: Yes. I'm Ken Desserault. 15 Grower, State of Washington, Yakima. 16 17 ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Would you spell your names for us? 18 MR. K. DESSERAULT: K-e-n D-e-s-s-e-r-a-u-l-t. 19 MR. SMITH: I'm Michael Smith. A grower 20 from Yakima. That's S-m-i-t-h. 21 MR. ROY: My name is Leslie Roy. L-e-s-l-i-e 22 and R-o-y. 23 ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Are you a grower 24

> York Stenographic Services, Inc. 34 North George St., York, PA 17401 - (717) 854-0077

25

as well?

1	MD DOV. Tim gamme year to-
1	MR. ROY: I'm sorry. Yes. I am.
2	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Where?
3	MR. ROY: From Yakima Valley.
4	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Thank you.
5	MR. CARPENTER: My name is Stephen Carpenter.
6	C-a-r-p-e-n-t-e-r. And I'm a member of the Proponents
7	Committee and a grower.
8	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: From where?
9	MR. CARPENTER: From Sunnyside.
10	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: California?
11	MR. CARPENTER: Washington.
12	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Washington.
13	Thank you.
14	MR. GASSELING: My name's Tom Gasseling. I'm a
15	grower from Wapato, Washington. It's on the
16	reservations so some people don't think it's part of
17	Washington, but it's Washington State.
18	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: And would you
19	spell the name of that for us?
20	MR. GASSELING: It's Tom, T-o-m, Gasseling,
21	G-a-s-s-e-l-i-n-g.
22	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: And the place
23	where you grow?
24	MR. GASSELING: Wapato, Washington.
25	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Spelled?
	York Stenographic Services, Inc.

```
1
                  MR. GASSELING: W-a-p-a-t-o.
 2
                  ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE:
                                                 Thank you.
                  MR. D. DESSERAULT: I'm Duane Desserault.
 3
 4
        D-u-a-n-e D-e-s-s-e-r-a-u-l-t. Grower from Mabton,
 5
        Washington, M-a-b-t-o-n.
                  MR. BRULOTTE: Reggie Brulotte. R-e-g-g-i-e
 6
        B-r-u-l-o-t-t-e. A grower from Toppenish, Washington.
 7
 8
        T-o-p-p-e-n-i-s-h.
 9
                  ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE:
                                                Thank you.
10
                  MR. NEWHOUSE: Thank you. My name is Dan
        Newhouse. I'm also a grower from Sunnyside, Washington.
11
12
        My name is spelled D-a-n N-e-w-h-o-u-s-e. I'm also a
13
        member of the Proponents Committee.
14
                  ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE:
                                                Thank you.
                                                           Now
       let's go to the table on the left side of the room, my
15
16
        right?
17
                  DR. JEKANOWSKI:
                                     I'm Mark Jekanowski.
                  ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: It's a little
18
19
        faint.
20
                  DR. JEKANOWSKI:
                                     Mark...
21
                  UNKNOWN: Turn on the mike.
22
                  DR. JEKANOWSKI:
                                    There we go. All right.
       Mark Jekanowski. I'm a agricultural economist with
23
       Sparks Companies. My name is spelled M-a-r-k
24
25
       J-e-k-a-n-o-w-s-k-i.
                         York Stenographic Services, Inc.
```

1	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: All right. Is
2	anyone else at your table expecting to speak, Mr.
3	Jekanowski? Anyone at your table?
4	DR. JEKANOWSKI: I don't think so. No.
5	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Oh, nobody's
6	there.
7	DR. JEKANOWSKI: There's nobody there.
8	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Nobody's there.
9	DR. JEKANOWSKI: You got me nervous there.
10	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Mr. Moody.
11	MR. MOODY: He is the important guy. He
12	gets his own table. Jim Moody. M-o-o-d-y. Washington,
13	DC. Counsel for the Hop Marketing Order Opponents
14	Group.
15	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: And just so that
16	was clear for the record, Mr. Moody, you said Opponents.
17	MR. MOODY: Opponents.
18	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Spelled
19	o-p-p-o
20	MR. MOODY: Yes. Maybe we just for
21	because it's easily confused name we ought to talk about
22	it as pro and con or some easy nickname or something.
23	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: All right. And
24	so what your clients are against are the proposals?
25	MR. MOODY: Yes.
	York Stenographic Services, Inc.

.... ...

i	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: All right. And
2	at your table?
3	MR. CARSWELL: Yes, Your Honor. My name is
4	Matthew with two t's, E. Carswell, C-a-r-s-w-e-l-l. I
5	am associate general counsel of Anheiser-Busch and we're
6	con.
7	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Thank you.
8	MR. CARSWELL: And no one else at your table,
9	I believe, will be speaking.
10	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: All right.
11	Thank you. All right. Our court reporter is Mark. And
12	I would ask that the court reporter stop us at any time
13	that we need to do something different in order to
14	create a better record. I'm going to instruct the court
15	reporter now and the people who will transcribe this
16	tape, who are probably different people than anyone in
17	this room, that the caption for this case first of
18	all, the heading for the transcript should read "United
19	States Department of Agriculture." And the second line,
20	"Before the Secretary of Agriculture." Then the caption
21	of the case should read IN re: And that's I-N r-e,
22	colon, Hops Produced in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and
23	California. The docket number over to the right side at
24	the top of each page of new volume of the transcript
25	should read Docket #AO-F&V-991-A3FV03-991-01. Now of
	York Stenographic Services, Inc.
	34 North George St., York, PA 17401 - (717) 854-0077

1	the exhibits that I m sufe will be introduced here there
2	will be copies of the Federal Register that include that
3	information, but I'm not going to have the exhibits sent
4	to the court reporting service. I'm going to ask that
5	counsel for the United States Government here today take
6	possession of those if that would be convenient, Ms.
7	Deskins, at the conclusion of the hearing and deliver
8	those to the hearing clerk in Washington, DC.
9	MS. DESKINS: Yes, Judge Clifton. That would
10	be fine. In fact, my colleague Anne Dec has some
11	experience with doing that so that shouldn't be a
12	problem. Right, Ann?
13	MS. DEC: Correct.
14	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Excellent. Now,
15	the court reporting service that is providing the
16	transcript on which this Decision will be made is the
17	York Stenographic Service in York, Pennsylvania. If
18	there's anyone here who will want to order a copy of the
19	transcript, hard copy and cassettes, little diskettes
20	for the computer, you may do that just for the cost of
21	reproduction, because the government has already paid
22	the price for getting this hearing recorded and
23	transcribed and that contract allows for any additional
24	person asking for a copy of it to get it at \$.20 a page
25	rather than the normal cost of ordering our transcript.
	York Stenographic Services, Inc.

1	I would ask at this point does the Government anticipate
2	putting a copy of the transcript on a website or any
3	such thing?
4	MS. DESKINS: Judge Clifton, yes, they do
5	anticipate putting it on the website, but just in case
6	they don't do that or people want it sooner than it goes
7	on the website, they do have the option of ordering the
8	transcript themselves or looking at it at the hearing
9	clerk's office.
10	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: All right.
11	Could everyone hear Ms. Deskins?
12	THE REPORTER: Please speak into the mike.
13	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: That's a good
14	example. Ms. Deskins was being polite in facing me as
15	she addressed me. We can't do that and still get the
16	microphone to pick it up. So if you're a witness
17	sitting right next to me don't look at me. And if the
18	person questioning you would draw your face away from
19	the mike don't look at them either. You really need to
20	speak to the mike. Ms. Deskins, would you just repeat
21	that for us please?
22	MS. DESKINS: Your Honor, we do anticipate
23	putting it on the Internet website, however, if people
24	want it sooner than when it's on the website, they do
25	have the option of looking at the hearing clerk's office
	York Stenographic Services, Inc.

in Washington, DC. A copy of it will also be available at the Portland Field Office for the Agricultural 2 3 Marketing Service here in Portland. But at this point, 4 we do anticipate putting it on the web page. 5 ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: All right. you're welcome also to order your own copy of it if you 7 want that. I want to give you the information for that. It's York Stenographic Services, 34 North George Street, 8 9 York, Pennsylvania, 17401. The fax number is 717-854-0122. Now, that company does lots of transcripts, not 10 all of which are subject to this government contract. 11 12 So to make sure you're not charged the market price, you 13 need to make it clear that you are ordering this as an 14 additional copy based on a government contract and therefore your cost is \$.20 a page. You need to make 15 16 that clear when you order the transcript. I do have a 17 format here for ordering a transcript from York under 18 this government arrangement. If you want a copy of that just see me and I'll provide that. You can even make 19 your request with the court reporter here. 20 21 should be done on their format. All right. I'd like to ask now if there are any other preliminary matters other 22 23 than those we've done so far before we actually get into the substance of this hearing. 24 25 MS. DESKINS: Judge Clifton, I did have one York Stenographic Services, Inc.

34 North George St., York, PA 17401 - (717) 854-0077

Į

1	clarifying point. Mr. Moody had said that he represents
2	opponents. Is that an opponents committee? Do they
3	have members in it? Could he just specify is it a group
4	of is it groups that are part of it?
5	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Thank you. Mr.
6	Moody.
7	MR. MOODY: Yes. Thank you, Sharlene.
8	It's a group of growers growing every day, but not
9	limited to any specific membership. We have some people
10	already identified who are going to be testifying, but
11	there certainly may be other people who are against the
12	Order that come forward that are as yet unaware to me.
13	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: All right. And
14	there's no formal committee?
15	MR. MOODY: No.
16	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Thank you. Mr.
17	Moody, were you also about to mention something
18	additional preliminary?
19	MR. MOODY: Yes, if Ms. Deskins is done.
20	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Yes.
21	MR. MOODY: I have a couple things. One as
22	to the timing of witnesses, we had a brief conference
23	amongst several of the counsel. And I sort of achieved
24	an informal agreement that the proponents would go first
25	at each location, would spend about half of the time. York Stenographic Services Inc.
	COEC MEDIOGRAPHIC NETVICES INC.

1	Dut then the services
	But then the cons then would begin at that point with
2	any of their testimony or others in the room who have
3	not identified themselves as yet. And in addition to
4	that general schedule, we know of other witnesses who
5	can come just on one particular day and we would ask
6	that they be accommodated on the day they're able to
7	come and give their testimony at that point.
8	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: All right. Now
9	that necessitates a bit of a timekeeper. I'll be happy
10	to serve that function, but I want to know whether you
11	anticipate right now that we'll need all three days this
12	week and whether we're expecting to divide this week
13	into a day and a half for the proponents and a day and a
14	half for the cons.
15	MR. MOODY: My anticipation is, yes. I
16	would defer to Brendan if he has any further thoughts on
17	that.
18	MR. MONAHAN: Thanks, Jim. Brendan Monahan
19	for the Proponents Committee. I hate to start out and
20	disagree with you at the very outset, Jim. I'm not sure
21	if we had an actual agreement to divvy it up 50/50. I'd
22	say that the Proponents Committee, only over the course
23	of the last couple of days, has put together a schedule,
24	which I've handed to Your Honor. I think we're going to
25	be able to stick to that schedule fairly closely. We

would envision making it through item 4, which is a 1 first round of hop producers in support of the proposal 2 here in Portland. And I would agree, Jim, it makes 3 sense for the Proponents Committee to certainly go first to complete its presentation and thereafter to hear from 5 6 the opposition. In terms of trying to gauge how long that would take, Your Honor, that's going to be dictated 7 in large part by the scope and breath of the questions that are presented to these witnesses. I believe that 9 we could get through item four certainly by noon 10 tomorrow unless there's some level of unanticipated 11 12 questioning. 13 ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Mr. Monahan, that leaves three categories that would not even be 14 commented on at all by proponents until we get to 15 16 Yakima, Washington. 17 MR. MONAHAN: That's -- well, that's not 18 entirely correctly, Your Honor. Number five is the 19 economic justification and that's been scheduled for 20 Yakima because that's where our expert is. That's where 21 Mr. Folwell is. And in terms of scheduling a particular witness, I believe he's the only one with an actual 22 constraint and inability to make it -- or unavailability 23 24 to testify here in Portland. 25 ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: And how is Mr.

1	Folwell's name spelled?
2	MR. MONAHAN: R-a-y-m-o-n-d, last name
3	F-o-l-w-e-l-l. And just from a presentation standpoint
4	it made sense, the Proponents believed, to have his
5	testimony come at the tail-end after we had gone through
6	the marketing order itself. Now, in terms of commenting
7	on economic justification there will be some testimony
8	regarding economic justification from a grower's
9	perspective. And that's going to be right off the bat
10	this morning when Mike Smith makes his presentation,
11	Your Honor.
12	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: All right. And
13	then the other two topics that you would be deferring
14	until we reconvene in Yakima, Washington would be the
15	Grower Referendum Procedures and the Hop Producer
16	Support Proposal?
17	MR. MONAHAN: That's true, Your Honor,
18	although you'll note that item four is also a Hop
19	Producer Support Proposal. The thought would be to also
20	allow growers in the Yakima region who are unable to
21	travel to these Oregon proceedings to have an
22	opportunity in Yakima to voice their support.
23	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Mr. Moody, do
24	you have any quarrel with responding with your second
25	half here even though Proponents would not yet have put
	York Stenographic Services, Inc.

```
1
       on, for example, their expert.
2
                                 Well, we have some people who
                 MR. MOODY:
3
       can only come here. And I just want to make sure they
4
       can get a chance to testify. And that's why we kind of
5
       suggested an even divvying up of the time.
6
       there's a gentleman here from the Beer Institute who
       needs to testify today. You know perhaps he could go as
7
       the first witness after lunch. Today is the only day
8
9
       he's able to come. So I don't have any objection to
10
       just stopping where we are with the Proponents'
11
       testimony approximately lunch tomorrow. You know
       there's just sort of -- you know, there just no real way
12
13
       to control the pace because the scope of cross-
       examination and the extent of it kind of depends on what
14
       the witnesses offer as far as their affirmative
15
16
       testimony.
17
                  ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE:
                                                All right.
18
       Let's not try to decide this in concrete now, but I'll
       be very aware of it as we go along. But I will keep
19
       track of time as far as how much time has been used by
20
       Proponents and how much time has been used by those
21
       presenting their position contrary to the proposals.
22
23
                  MR. MONAHAN:
                                 Also, Your Honor, for what it's
       worth, I think the way that it's going to break down is
24
25
        that the lion's share of the proposal of the evidence
```

here in Portland and the presentation in Yakima will much more limited, I believe. ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: All right. sounds to me that we will need all three days here Portland. Do you agree with that, Mr. Monahan? MR. MONAHAN: I, of course, have no idea the Opposition has in mind, but it wouldn't surpris Your Honor. ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: All right. Moody, do you think we'll need all three days here Portland? MR. MOODY: Yes, Your Honor. ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: All right. regard to Yakima, do you have any estimate just for planning purposes for those who are participating, Moody? Any idea whether we'll need all five days i	It in what e me,
ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: All right. Sounds to me that we will need all three days here Portland. Do you agree with that, Mr. Monahan? MR. MONAHAN: I, of course, have no idea the Opposition has in mind, but it wouldn't surpris Your Honor. ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: All right. Moody, do you think we'll need all three days here Portland? MR. MOODY: Yes, Your Honor. ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: All right. regard to Yakima, do you have any estimate just for planning purposes for those who are participating, Moody? Any idea whether we'll need all five days i	in what e me, Mr.
sounds to me that we will need all three days here Portland. Do you agree with that, Mr. Monahan? MR. MONAHAN: I, of course, have no idea the Opposition has in mind, but it wouldn't surpris your Honor. ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: All right. Moody, do you think we'll need all three days here Portland? MR. MOODY: Yes, Your Honor. ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: All right. regard to Yakima, do you have any estimate just for planning purposes for those who are participating, Moody? Any idea whether we'll need all five days i	in what e me, Mr.
Portland. Do you agree with that, Mr. Monahan? MR. MONAHAN: I, of course, have no idea the Opposition has in mind, but it wouldn't surpris Your Honor. ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: All right. Moody, do you think we'll need all three days here Portland? MR. MOODY: Yes, Your Honor. MR. MOODY: Yes, Your Honor. ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: All right. regard to Yakima, do you have any estimate just for planning purposes for those who are participating, Moody? Any idea whether we'll need all five days i	what e me, Mr.
MR. MONAHAN: I, of course, have no idea the Opposition has in mind, but it wouldn't surpris Your Honor. ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: All right. Moody, do you think we'll need all three days here Portland? MR. MOODY: Yes, Your Honor. ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: All right. regard to Yakima, do you have any estimate just for planning purposes for those who are participating, Moody? Any idea whether we'll need all five days i	e me, Mr.
the Opposition has in mind, but it wouldn't surpris Your Honor. ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: All right. Moody, do you think we'll need all three days here Portland? MR. MOODY: Yes, Your Honor. ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: All right. regard to Yakima, do you have any estimate just for planning purposes for those who are participating, Moody? Any idea whether we'll need all five days i	e me, Mr.
9 Your Honor. 10 ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: All right. 11 Moody, do you think we'll need all three days here 12 Portland? 13 MR. MOODY: Yes, Your Honor. 14 ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: All right. 15 regard to Yakima, do you have any estimate just for planning purposes for those who are participating, 16 Moody? Any idea whether we'll need all five days i	Mr.
ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: All right. Moody, do you think we'll need all three days here Portland? MR. MOODY: Yes, Your Honor. ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: All right. regard to Yakima, do you have any estimate just for planning purposes for those who are participating, Moody? Any idea whether we'll need all five days i	
Moody, do you think we'll need all three days here Portland? MR. MOODY: Yes, Your Honor. ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: All right. regard to Yakima, do you have any estimate just for planning purposes for those who are participating, Moody? Any idea whether we'll need all five days i	
Portland? MR. MOODY: Yes, Your Honor. ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: All right. regard to Yakima, do you have any estimate just for planning purposes for those who are participating, Moody? Any idea whether we'll need all five days i	in
MR. MOODY: Yes, Your Honor. ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: All right. regard to Yakima, do you have any estimate just for planning purposes for those who are participating, Moody? Any idea whether we'll need all five days i	
ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: All right. 15 regard to Yakima, do you have any estimate just for 16 planning purposes for those who are participating, 17 Moody? Any idea whether we'll need all five days i	
regard to Yakima, do you have any estimate just for planning purposes for those who are participating, Moody? Any idea whether we'll need all five days i	
planning purposes for those who are participating, Moody? Any idea whether we'll need all five days i	With
17 Moody? Any idea whether we'll need all five days i	
1 1 1	Mr.
18 Yakima next week?	n
To Talizina nelle negati	
MR. MOODY: Yes. I believe we will, Y	our
Honor.	
21 ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: All right.	All
right. Any other preliminary matters? All right.	
Well, I'd like to take a 10-minute break before we	begin
24 with the evidence or opening statements or whatever	you
would have. Mr. Moody?	
York Stenographic Services, Inc.	

1	MR. MOODY: If we're still doing
2	preliminary matters, I have another preliminary matter.
3	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: All right.
4	Thank you.
5	MR. MOODY: Okay. And thank you. And that
6	is basically our request for the Court to take judicial
7	notice of the hearing record and testimony from the 1984
8	hearing record on amendments that eventually led to
9	termination of the old program. A bit of brief
10	background. We were first advised that that record had
11	been destroyed, which came as somewhat of a surprise
12	since this proposal has been pending at the Department
13	since at least last December. It would be surprising to
14	see the historical record of the proceeding that led to
15	termination of the old program destroyed midstream.
16	However, the hearing clerk's office was kind enough to
17	go out to the archives in Sutland and retrieve the old
18	record literally from the flames. And so that is
19	available in the hearing clerk's office now. And
20	because USDA is essentially trying to reestablish a
21	program on the basis of a record hearing they
22	terminated, the evidence presented at that proceeding
23	and then setting forth the conditions justifying
24	terminating is highly relevant to this proceeding
25	because it's kind of a classic arbitrary decision for an
	York Stenographic Services Inc

1	agency to just reverse course without incurring a heavy
2	burden in justifying that reversal. So we would ask
3	that the Court take judicial notice of the record and
4	evidence and testimony from that '84 proceeding.
5	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Mr. Moody, I'm
6	very glad that you brought this issue up at the
7	beginning so people can ponder it, but I'm going to ask
8	you to renew that motion in the evidentiary portion of
9	the proceeding.
10	MR. MOODY: Okay. Thank you.
11	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: You're welcome.
12	All right. Let's take a 10-minute break, if you will,
13	and be back ready to go at 9:51. Thank you.
14	***
15	[Off the record.]
16	[On the record.]
17	***
18	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: We're back on
19	record now at 9:53. One other comment about the way
20	we'll handle exhibits. When you identify an exhibit
21	we'll give it a number. And if you already have some
22	pre-marked let me know that know. Does anybody has
23	anybody marked exhibits ahead of time with any numbers?
24	Okay. Not yet. Mr. Moody.
25	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Yes, Your Honor.
	York Stenographic Services, Inc.

1	I don't know if Sharlene had planned to do this already
2	but
3	THE REPORTER: Turn on the mike.
4	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Is the mike on?
5	THE REPORTER: The switch on the top.
6	MR. MOODY: I don't know if Sharlene had
7	done this already but there's two things, I guess, that
8	probably need to be exhibits and one is the Notice of
9	Hearing with proposals and the data table assembled by
10	USDA. There's lots of copies of those floating around
11	but I don't know if they're going to be formally made
12	exhibits. They could be one and two. The other
13	question I had is to make sure that the transcript is
14	numbered sequentially and doesn't start over at one
15	every day.
16	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Good. Thank
17	you. I meant to mention that. I will mention that each
18	day when we start. This will be volume I of the
19	transcript. Each day is a separate volume, but the
20	pages should be sequential so that there's never another
21	page one even though we'll have three days this week and
22	five days next week. Also, while we're making this
23	transcript, I'm going to ask the court reporter to
24	change tapes when it's nearly 45 minutes after we've
25	begun a new tape and ask him to gauge when might be a
	York Stenographic Services, Inc.
	34 North George St., York, PA 17401 - (717) 854-0077

1	good time to interrupt the speaker. So when the court
2	reporter asks you to stop, please stop right there,
3	gather your thoughts, because I'd like you to start that
4	sentence again when we've got the new tape in the
5	machine. All right. Ms. Deskins, do you have in mind
6	to introduce the exhibits that Mr. Moody mentioned?
7	MS. DESKINS: Yes. That was my intention.
8	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: All right.
9	Let's begin then with what the Government would like to
10	mark as exhibits and have accepted into evidence and
11	anything else the Government would like to present
12	before the proponents go forward.
13	MS. DESKINS: Thank you, Judge Clifton. The
14	first thing we'd like to introduce, it's a copy of the
15	Notice of Hearing for this. And I'd just like to point
16	out that there was one that was published in I'm
17	looking for the day July 28, 2003 and there was also
18	another one that was published on August 14. I'm going
19	to hand them to the court reporter. And also, I'd just
20	like to note
21	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Now, also,
22	Ms. Deskins, the one that actually had today's dates in
23	it, I have copies of that. That's the September 8
24	MS. DESKINS: Right. There's also September
25	8.
	York Stenographic Services, Inc.

1	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE:2003.
2	MS. DESKINS: And there's a slight error I
3	wanted to point out in the September 8 notice, which is
4	Proposal #10, should actually be Proposal #11.
5	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Thank you. Are
6	you going to just pencil through that on the one that
7	we'll make of record?
8	MS. DESKINS: Yes.
9	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: If you would do
10	that, pencil through the 10, mark 11.
11	MS. DESKINS: Actually I'm going to mark it
12	in ink.
13	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Good.
14	MS. DESKINS: Okay. And let me give one copy
15	to the court reporter.
16	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Please. Now, is
17	all of that one exhibit?
18	MS. DESKINS: Yes. It is.
19	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Thank you. So I
20	would ask the court reporter then to mark that as
21	Exhibit 1 and I'd like the court reporter to retain
22	custody of all these exhibit until we conclude here in
23	Portland because he can hand them to the witnesses that
24	might be asked to testify about them. And then only
25	when we're ready to leave Portland will he turn over
	York Stenographic Services, Inc.

1	custody of those to Ms. Dec.
2	MS. DESKINS: Judge Clifton, I have some
3	other exhibits as well.
4	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: All right.
5	MS. DESKINS: The next one I have is the
6	Certificate of Official Notice. And I'm going to hand a
7	copy to the court reporter and I'd like it marked as
8	Exhibit 2.
9	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: All right. And
10	the actual title to that document is Certificate of
11	Officials Notified.
12	MS. DESKINS: And Judge Clifton, I have
13	another exhibit. Okay. It would be marked I want it
14	marked as Exhibit #3 and it's a Certificate of Mailing.
15	And it certifies that interested persons have been
16	notified by it. I'm going to hand a copy to the court
17	reporter. Judge Clifton, there's a fourth exhibit we'd
18	like to put in and Ms. Razick is going to do that one.
19	MS. RAZICK: Your Honor, I would like to
20	admit certificate regarding making news releases
21	available to local newspapers, television and radio
22	stations as Exhibit 4.
23	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: You may. And if
24	you'll hand that to the court reporter.
25	MS. DESKINS: Judge Clifton, I would move for
	York Stenographic Services, Inc.
	34 North George St., York, PA 17401 - (717) 854-0077

1	the admission of those four exhibits.
2	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Are there any
3	objections to the admission into evidence of Exhibit 1,
4	Exhibit 2, Exhibit 3 or Exhibit 4? There being none,
5	those four exhibits are hereby admitted into evidence.
6	MS. DESKINS: Judge Clifton, at this time we
7	do have a witness that we'd like to call. It's Dr.
8	Donald Hinman.
9	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: You may be
10	seated and then I'll place you under oath. Please again
11	state your full name and spell it.
12	MR. HINMAN: My name is Donald Hinman.
13	D-o-n-a-l-d H-i-n-m-a-n.
14	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: All right. And
15	I assume your doctorate is a Ph.D.
16	DR. HINMAN: That is correct.
17	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: In what field?
18	DR. HINMAN: Agricultural economics.
19	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: All right.
20	Would you raise your right hand please?
21	***
22	[Witness sworn]
23	***
24	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Thank you.
25	Ms. Deskins, you may proceed.

1	***
2	DONALD HINMAN,
3	having first been duly sworn, according to the law,
4	testified as follows:
5	BY MS. DESKINS:
6	Q. Dr. Hinman, could you please tell us what
7	your office address is?
8	A. U.S. Department of Agriculture, 1400
9	Independence Avenue Southwest, Washington, DC, 20250-
10	0241.
11	Q. And other than your doctorate do you have
12	any other higher educational degrees?
13	A. A master's degree in the same subject,
14	agricultural economics.
15	Q. Okay. And do you have any other degrees?
16	A. A bachelor's degree in political science
17	and economics.
18	Q. Okay. Can you tell us a little bit about
19	your work history since college?
20	A. Since undergraduate work?
21	Q. Well, no. After you graduated from
22	college, could you just briefly tell us about your work
23	experience?
24	A. Okay. I had worked for the USDA for five
25	years briefly for the Economic Research Service, then
	York Stenographic Services, Inc.

1	for the Federal Milk Market Administrator in Boston,
2	Massachusetts. Then several years in the Peace Corps,
3	volunteer in West Africa in Cameroon, followed by
4	graduate school. And then I resumed a after graduat
5	school a work history with a working for Michigan
6	State University where I did my graduate work doing
7	teaching and research. And then I did the same thing,
8	teaching, research and extension at the University of
9	Wisconsin in Superior.
10	Q. Okay. And can you tell us what your
11	current position is?
12	A. I'm an economist with the Economic
13	Analysis Program and Planning Branch, Fruit and
14	Vegetable Programs, AMS.
15	Q. And how long have you had that position?
16	A. Since June 2001.
17	Q. Okay. And AMS stands for Agricultural
18	Marketing Service. Correct?
19	A. Agricultural Marketing Service.
20	Q. As part of your job duties, did you do
21	anything for this particular hearing?
22	A. Yes. I prepared a statistical summary,
23	which has been, I believe, you know, distributed
24	throughout the room.
25	마르크 (1985년) 이 경우 경우 시간

1	MS. DESKINS: Okay. Judge Clifton, I would
2	like to have that marked as this time as I believe we're
3	on Exhibit #5.
4	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Correct.
5	MS. DESKINS Okay. It's now been marked as
6	Exhibit #5. Can you do you have a statement that
7	you'd like to read us about the exhibit?
8	DR. HINMAN: Yes.
9	MS. DESKINS: Okay. Please proceed.
.0	DR. HINMAN: I compiled this statistical
.1	summary from four USDA source, the National Agricultural
12	Statistics Service or NASS and the NASS state counter
13	parts in Idaho, Oregon and Washington, second, Hops
14	Market News published by the Agricultural Marketing
15	Service, three, the Foreign Agricultural Service and
16	four, the Economic Research Service. I also drew on
17	data from the Department of Commerce and this
18	compilation includes 12 tables and several graphs. And
19	I will actually walk through this document page by page
20	indicating the certain tables.
21	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Let me stop you
22	just a moment. Is there anyone in the room who does not
23	have access to this report? Do all of you have a copy
24	that want a copy? Okay. Is there anyone else who would
25	like a copy of the report? Dr. Hinman, you may begin.
	York Stenographic Services, Inc.
	34 North George St., York, PA 17401 - (717) 854-0077

1	DR. HINMAN: I'll be going through this and
2	indicating the page numbers and table numbers. On page
3	1, Table 1 presents acreage yield production, season
4	average grower price and value of production. Two
5	graphs on page 2 compare yield to production and acreage
6	to production. The data on the graphs indicate that the
7	variability in production is due more to changes in
8	acreage than to changes in yield. Average yields have
9	been above 1,500 pounds per acre since 1950. The lowest
10	yield in the last 10 years was 1625 in 1998. Yields
11	have been above 1800 pounds since 1999 and reached 1990
12	in 2002. Over the last 20 years, production has ranged
13	as low as 49 million pounds in 1986 and was nearly 79
14	million pounds in 1995. Hops were harvested on 25,000
15	acres in 1986 and peaked at over 44,000 acres. I think
16	I made a I'm pausing here for a minute because I
17	think I may have, in my statement here, not gotten the
18	acreage address here number. Yeah. Okay. Hops were
19	harvested in 25,000 acres in 1986 and peaked at over
20	44,000 acres in 1996. Have rested acres declined
21	significantly in 1998 and again in 2002? Production was
22	58 million pounds in 2002 when it was valued at 113
23	million dollars. Seasoned average grower price per
24	pound average \$1.76 over the last 10 years and \$1.82
25	over the last five years. Turning then to pages 3 and
	York Stenographic Services, Inc.

4, Table 1A presents inflation adjusted grower prices
from Table 1. Now continuing to page 5. On page 5,
Table 2 shows production levels, acreage and yields in
each of the three hops producing states, Idaho, Oregon
and Washington. Over the past five years, the share of
production has average 76 percent for Washington, 17
percent for Oregon and 8 percent for Idaho. Acreage
shares have averaged 73 percent, 17 percent and 10
percent. Average yield has been 1933 pounds for
Washington, 1748 for Oregon, 1401 for Idaho. Turning to
page 7, on page 7, Table 2A provides acreage data back
to 1950, an historical overview. California was the
number one state number two state in terms of acreage
until the mid early-1960's but production declined to
the point where California data was no longer published
by the mid-1980's. Turning to page 9. Table 3 shows
hop stocks and a notable trend over the last 25 years
has been the increasing qualities of stocks held by
dealers and growers. Dealer/grower stock exceeded
stocks held by brewers in 2002. Page 10, Table 4
presents the hops varieties for which acreage, yield and
production data were published in 2002. The top five
varieties accounted for 65 percent of total U.S.
production in 2002. On pages 11 and 13, Tables 5 and 6
show the production and acreage since 1996 of each
York Stenographic Services, Inc.

variety of hops for which published data is available.
Columbus Tomahawk is the variety with the largest
production with 10.5 million pounds in 2002, 18 percent
of the total. Willamette [ph] is the variety with the
most acreage, 5766 acres in 2002. And following Tables
5 and 6, on pages 12 let's see now on pages 12 and
14 are additional tables, which show production and
acreage by variety in each state. Turning to Table 7 on
page 15. This table shows supply and utilization.
Production plus carriage stocks plus imports sum to the
figure the column called "Total supply." In the
columns labeled "Utilization," the sum of brewery usage
plus exports plus carry out stocks plus a statistical
adjustment known as the balancing item. Domestic usage
in the third to the last column is computated by
subtracting imports from brewery usage. Over the time
period shown, domestic usage of U.S. hops has average 42
percent and approximately 58 percent has been exported.
This data, however, should be viewed with caution. The
size of the balancing item shows that comparing supply
and demand has some error associated with it. The table
ends in 1996 after which brewery usage and the balancing
item were no longer published in AMS Hops Market News.
On page 16, Table 8, presents the annual parity price
for hops since 1998 along with season-average grower
York Stenographic Services, Inc.

```
price. On page 17, Table 9, shows the value of hop
1
       exports and imports, showing an increasing gap between
2
3
       the value of exports when compared to imports. And on
       pages 18, 19 and 20, Table 10 presents the value of
4
5
       exports by country. Table 11, on page 21, shows the
       value of U.S. imports by region and country. On page 22
6
7
       is Table 12, which presents a summary of annual exchange
       rates, comparing the U.S. to an average of foreign
8
9
       currencies for all our trading partners from 1970 to
              2003 is a projection. And into the summary, I'm
10
       also submitting an additional eight-page compilation
11
12
       which has no hops data associated with it as a
       compilation of exchange rates from which all countries
13
14
       with which the U.S. trades agricultural products.
                  MS. DESKINS:
                                 Judge Clifton, I have a copy of
15
16
       that I'd like to give to the court reporter.
                  ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE:
17
                                                Yes.
                                                      Please.
                  MS. DESKINS:
                                Judge Clifton, I have one more
18
       copy of that if someone wants it or if people want to
19
       share it and look at it.
20
21
                  ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE:
                                                Does Mr. Moody
       have one?
22
23
                  DR. HINMAN: And that concludes my
24
        statement.
25
                  MS. DESKINS:
                                 Judge Clifton, I would like to
```

1	have that last one marked as Exhibit #6.
2	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: All right. And
3	Exhibit 6 is the detail from which page 22 of Exhibit 5
4	was prepared. Am I correct, Dr. Hinman?
5	DR. HINMAN: Yes. No. No. Actually
6	well, it is the basis of it in the sense that Table 12
7	is done by the Economic Research Service of the USDA and
8	they take what they call the bilateral exchange rates
9	from the additional exhibit and they weight them
10	according to the amount of trade, compute this sort of
11	annual summary that reflects the overall exchange rates
12	for all of our trading partners.
13	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Thank you.
14	***
15	BY MS. DESKINS:
16	Q. Dr. Hinman, you did not prepare #6.
17	Correct?
18	A. I did not. This was basically obtained
19	from the Foreign Agricultural Service and printed out
20	for this purpose.
21	Q. Okay. So it's a reference guide of how
22	you it's a reference guide of what the exchange rates
23	are.
24	A. That is correct.
25	Q. Dr. Hinman, in regards to Exhibit #5,
	York Stenographic Services, Inc.
	34 North George St., York, PA 17401 - (717) 854-0077

l	you've had a chance to look at it now. Is it correct to
2	the best of your knowledge?
3	A. Yes.
4	Q. And you prepared all of Exhibit #5?
5	A. Yes.
6	Q. And in regards to Exhibit #6, that's
7	information that you obtained from the Foreign
8	Agricultural Service.
9	A. That is correct.
10	Q. And Foreign Agricultural Service is part
11	of the United States Department of Agriculture?
12	A. That is correct.
13	Q. Okay. At this time, Judge Clifton, I
14	would move for the admission of 5 and 6.
15	***
16	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Mr. Moody, would
17	you like to be heard.
18	MR. MOODY: I just have a couple of
19	questions about the data.
20	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: All right. You
21	may voir dire the witness.
22	***
23	VOIR DIRE
24	BY MR. MOODY:
25	Q. Thank you. Dr. Hinman, on your Table #1,
	York Stenographic Services, Inc.

1	I think yo	ou wer	nt by it kind of fast. I didn't get this
2	down. But	you	say with a 10-year average grower price
3	you had th	ne las	st 10 years and the 10 years previous to
4	that.		
5		А.	No. It was the first figure was 10
6	years and	then	the second figure was five years.
7		Q.	Okay. So the first figure was '92 to
8	'02.		
9		A.	Correct.
10		Q.	And what's that figure?
11		Α.	\$1.76. And the last five years is \$1.82.
12		Q.	And that's a weighted average grower
13	return?		
14		Α.	No. Simple average of the prices that
15	appear he	re.	
16		Q.	So a simple average.
17		А.	Yes.
18		Q.	Not weighted by total production.
19		Α.	Not weighted by total production of each
20	year. Ju	st a :	simple average of the prices that appear
21	five and	10 yea	ars back.
22		Q.	All right. On your parity price table,
23	which I t	hink .	is Table 8, is there any particular reason
24	you only	inclu	ded the last five years on that table
25	rather th	an go	ing back, as many of your other tables do,
			York Stenographic Services, Inc.

. . . .

1	to 1945?
2	A. I thought for purposes of this hearing
3	this was an adequate record showing the relationship
4	between parity price and season average grower price.
5	Q. Okay. Do you have data back to 1945?
6	A. It could be obtained. It would not be
7	easy to do that here.
8	Q. Okay. It's just that the reason I ask
9	the question is because one of the authorized purposes
10	of the Statute is to raise prices to parity, and so I
11	think it would be very useful to have the side-by-side
12	comparison of the actual grower price and the parity
13	price back as your other tables do, back to 1945.
14	And I wondered if you'd be willing to not today, of
15	course but obtain that data for the record so we can
16	have all of our historical snapshots be kind of covering
17	the same period of time.
18	A. Let me ask a procedural question. Could
19	this be submitted in the post-hearing process?
20	***
21	MS. DESKINS: No. It would have to be during
22	the public hearing.
23	DR. HINMAN: Okay.
24	MR. MOODY: So it would be like before next
25	Friday.
	11 1 0 1 1

i	DR. HINMAN: I will attempt to obtain that.
2	MR. MOODY: All right.
3	DR. HINMAN: I cannot guarantee it.
4	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Any other voir
5	dire questions, Mr. Moody?
6	MR. MOODY: Thank you, Dr. Hinman.
7	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: All right. Any
8	voir dire questions from anyone else?
9	***
10	BY MR. CARSWELL:
11	Q. Yes. Matt Carswell, Your Honor. If I
12	could refer you to Table 3, Dr. Hinman, you reference
13	this table, I believe, showing a trend in stocks held by
14	dealer/growers. And I was just wondering if you would
15	also indicate that there seems to be a trend of lower
16	stocks held by brewers based on the numbers shown.
17	A. Yes. I acknowledge that.
18	Q. Finally, on Table 11, this is information
19	about the value of imports into the U.S. And I was just
20	wondering if you have information showing foreign trade
21	outside the U.S., in other words, exports from third-
22	party countries to other third-party countries?
23	A. I believe that data is available. Again,
24	would you like that submitted for the record?
25	Q. If possible.
	York Stenographic Services, Inc.
	34 North George St., York, PA 17401 - (717) 854-0077

1	A. Okay. I will again, I will review
2	that. My intent in this record was to focus on the U.S
3	trading position. I will attempt to find the other
4	data.
5	Q. I believe it would be relevant. Thank
6	you, sir.
7	A. Thank you.
8	***
9	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Any other
10	questions about these exhibits? Is there any objection
11	to the admission into evidence of either Exhibit 5 or
12	Exhibit 6? There being none, Exhibits 5 and 6 are
13	hereby admitted into evidence.
14	MS. DESKINS: Judge Clifton, I have no
15	further questions for this witness.
16	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: All right.
17	Would anyone like to cross-examine this witness? Mr.
18	Moody.
19	***
20	CROSS-EXAMINATION
21	BY MR. MOODY:
22	Q. Dr. Hinman, thank you. You said you are
23	presently with Economic Evaluation Branch at AMS?
24	A. Economic Analysis and Program Planning
	A. Economic Analysis and Program Planning
25	Branch.

1	Q. Yeah. And that's
2	A. Fruit and Vegetable Programs,
3	Agricultural Marketing Service.
4	Q. All right. Have you performed an
5	analysis of any of the data you've prepared here to look
6	at, for example, price variability during the old orders
7	compared to the time between the old orders and now?
8	A. I have not.
9	Q. Have you performed any kind of economic
10	analysis concerning the questions listed in the Federal
11	Register?
12	A. I have not.
13	Q. Are you aware of anybody else in the
14	department who's performed any economic analysis of the
15	hops industry?
16	A. I'm not aware of anyone.
17	Q. Okay. Thank you very much, Dr. Hinman.
18	Excuse me. I have one other question. What position do
19	you have regarding the question of what degree of supply
20	and price fluctuation is deemed reasonable under the
21	AMAA?
22	A. I don't think I could put a fixed number
23	on it. It varies by crop and I would not be able to
24	state one for this crop.
25	Q. Okay. Can you state a methodology for
	York Stenographic Services, Inc.

1	how such reasonable fluctuation would be determined?
2	A. I guess I we could compute a
3	fluctuation of various prices and then compare them, but
4	I do not know the specific methodology to decide what is
5	a reasonable fluctuation and what would not be.
6	Q. All right. Do you have an opinion as to
7	whether a price variation since termination of the old
8	order have been reasonable or unreasonable?
9	A. I have no opinion.
10	Q. All right. Thank you, Dr. Hinman.
11	* * *
12	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Mr. Carswell.
13	MR. CARSWELL: Thank you, Your Honor. We have
14	some data that indicates that Table 5C, which reflects
15	Idaho hop production, may be inaccurate. And I would
16	just request, Dr. Hinman, if you could check these
17	numbers. Our indications are that it would be instead
18	of 3399 it would be more like 55 the number we have
19	is 5519. And so I just request if you could check those
20	numbers and confirm their accuracy.
21	DR. HINMAN: Thank you. I will do so.
22	MR. CARSWELL: And you have it different
23	earlier you have it correct earlier, which indicates
24	these numbers are incorrect.
25	DR. HINMAN: Thank you.
	York Stenographic Services, Inc.

1	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Dr. Hinman, are
2	you clear or do you want to take notes on what it is
3	that Mr. Moody has requested you provide by the end of
4	the hearing or what Mr. Carswell has requested that you
5	provide?
6	DR. HINMAN: Mr. Carswell asked that there
7	be additional international trade data basically between
8	third-party countries from other exporters/ importers to
9	other exporter/importers, not the U.S. Do you have any
10	specific time period? Would this time period on these
11	tables be adequate?
12	MR. CARSWELL: Yes, sir.
13	DR. HINMAN: Okay. And then
14	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: And with regard
15	to Mr. Moody's request.
16	DR. HINMAN: He asked for a computation of
17	parity prices going back considerably farther. And
18	actually, Mr. Moody, maybe you could state for the
19	record how far back you would like that record to go?
20	MR. MOODY: Your other tables go back to
21	1945 so that's fine or another time period would be the
22	beginning of the old order, which I think was 66. 1945
23	if you got I think those I've seen USDA reports
24	that go back that far. So I think you can get it from
25	1945.

1	MS. DESKINS: Judge Clifton, I mean if Mr.
2	Moody has access to that information I think it would be
3	easier for him to get than to try to get Mr. Hinman to
4	do that because he is supposed to be here during the
5	hearing to listen to the evidence that's presented. And
6	I don't know that he'd have time to get if Mr. Moody
7	does have it, then he could put that into the record.
8	MR. MOODY: Right. No. Actually, I had
9	seen the older, historical reports I had seen for
10	other commodities. I don't know what source Mr Dr.
11	Hinman would have for hops. I'm assuming somebody in
12	his office or ERS would have that data and could just
13	fax it out here.
14	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: I would ask Dr.
15	Hinman to make a reasonable attempt to get the
16	information that's requested. We know there's no
17	guarantee, Dr. Hinman, that you'll be able to. And I do
18	want you in here during the proceedings so that limits
19	you as well. Yes. Mr. Carswell.
20	MR. CARSWELL: I'm sorry. We're kind of going
21	back and forth on you. I apologize for that. It's been
22	told to me, Dr. Hinman, that on Table 5C that number
23	3399 is actually the acreage number and that the 5519 is
24	the correct production number that you've indicated
25	elsewhere. Just to help you and because we can't talk
	York Stenographic Services, Inc.

1	to you off the record.
2	DR. HINMAN: Okay. Thank you. I will make
3	that correction.
4	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Is there any
5	further cross-examination of this witness? Yes, sir.
6	***
7	BY DR. JEKANOWSKI:
8	Q. Mark Jekanowski. I'm with Sparks
9	Companies. Dr. Hinman, can you go into any more detail
10	or give a brief explanation as to why Table 7, the data
11	series, stops at 1996?
12	A. I was relying on my sources, AMS Hops
13	Market News. And after that point they no longer
14	published. If you obtain copies of Hops Market News at
15	that point onward they do not publish this figure
16	brewery usage or a balancing item. So it was no longer
17	possible to make a computation of this nature.
18	Q. Any idea why they no longer published
19	that?
20	A. Not entirely sure. I believe it's a
21	combination of that the the brewery usage figure I
22	think is at some point I believe the brewery
23	reporting became voluntary is my understanding so that
24	made some of the figures less available. And I believe
25	it also has to do with a backlog of work at the AMS
	York Stenographic Services, Inc.
	34 North George St., York, PA 17401 - (717) 854-0077

1	office.
2	Q. Wouldn't data such as this be critical if
3	somebody were to try to forecast supply or demand in
4	your opinion?
5	A. It would be helpful if this data
6	continued. I notice that the AMS Market News says that
7	they will no longer publish the balancing item. And I
8	think some of the other data is just not available or
9	not up to date. So it would be helpful. It's just not
10	available in a published source that I could obtain it.
11	Q. What exactly is the balancing item?
12	A. It is a figure, as I understand it, that
13	represents when they do a table like this, the AMS
14	Market News, for years, published a table where they
15	added up supply and demand in this nature and they found
16	that there was a difference in the result and that
17	difference they labeled the balancing item. So it was
18	an acknowledgement of the fact that the data was
19	imperfect.
20	Q. So would you call it error basically?
21	A. Yes. An error in computation but it's
22	error of really in an unknown direction.
23	Q. Sure. But it's pretty clear that in some
24	years there's a huge amount of error as a proportion to
25	the production

1	A. Yes.
2	Qor carry in stocks.
3	A. I did acknowledge. These figures and any
4	percentage should be used with caution. I computed them
5	because I thought it would be indicative and helpful,
6	but the data should be used with caution for that very
7	reason.
8	Q. I'm finished, Your Honor.
9	***
10	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Are there any
11	other cross-examination questions for this witness?
12	There being none, is there any redirect examination, Ms.
13	Deskins?
14	MS. DESKINS: No further questions.
15	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: All right.
16	Thank you, Dr. Hinman. You may step down. Ms. Deskins.
17	MS. DESKINS: We have no further witnesses.
18	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: All right. I
19	have not counted this time as the Proponents' time. It
20	was the Government's time. I'll now begin to count the
21	Government's time. It's approximately 10:30. It's
22	10:28. And the government may proceed. Excuse me. The
23	Proponents may proceed.
24	MR. MONAHAN: Thank you, Your Honor. Brendan
25	Monahan for the Proponents Committee. Your Honor, I
	York Stenographic Services, Inc.

1	represent the proponents of the Hop Marketing Order.
2	The persons assembled at the two tables to my left are
3	indeed the members of the Proponents Committee. They're
4	the folks that have worked the last two years to try to
5	fashion a solution for the oversupply and other
6	marketing conditions that are facing the Hop industry.
7	Each one of these committee members is going to make the
8	long trek up to the witness stand today and to offer
9	testimony in support of the proposal. The first two
10	witnesses are going to be Mr. Carpenter and Mr. Smith.
11	They're going to offer primarily historical information,
12	what the Hop industry has done over the last two years
13	that brings us to today's stage where we actually have a
14	formal order that is being proposed, the other efforts
15	that were made before we got to today. Mr. Smith is
16	going to talk a little bit about the economic and
17	marketing conditions that face the members of the
18	industry, mainly from a grower's perspective. After
19	that, we're actually going to go through the marketing
20	order provision by provision. And we've taken a
21	teamwork approach, Your Honor. We've divvied it up.
22	Different committee members are going to be speaking in
23	support or rather discussing specified provisions in the
24	proposal. One thing just a point of order, Your
25	Honor had asked that witnesses take the chair to your
	York Stenographic Services, Inc.

1	left. And that seems entirely appropriate. When there
2	is cross-examination however, Your Honor, there are
3	members of the committee who are perhaps better versed
4	in certain areas of the verbiage in the proposal, and I
5	would ask with, Your Honor's permission, that in the
6	event of cross-examination that the questions be
7	proposed to the committee itself as there may be someone
8	who is not carrying the torch for a particular provision
9	in the witness chair at a given time.
10	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: All right. I'll
11	reserve judgment on that request, Mr. Monahan. It could
12	be useful for cross-examination to be directed to the
13	witness who's just spoken, for example, if he is unaware
14	of certain facts that might change his opinion and the
15	like. So those of you who wish to cross-examine, if you
16	have a question that is specific to the witness you can
17	say so. If you have a question that you just like to
18	have answered by the committee, you may say so. And Mr.
19	Monahan, at any time, you may alert me that perhaps a
20	better answer could be obtained from the committee. But
21	I'll rule step-by-step as we go.
22	MR. MONAHAN: Thank you, Your Honor.
23	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: You're welcome.
24	MR. MONAHAN: Your Honor, just to also a
25	point of order, many of the witnesses have prepared
	York Stenographic Services, Inc.

1	written statements. Those written statement vary in
2	their degrees of complexity and comprehensiveness. Some
3	of them are verbatim and the witnesses will be reading
4	from those written statements. Others are more of a
5	bullet point outline written statement. What we
6	envision is at the conclusion of the Proponents'
7	testimony to offer those written statements as evidence
8	as a supplement to the verbal testimony that's offered,
9	Your Honor.
10	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: And I accept
11	those. I think that's very helpful. It's always a
12	little problematic if the witness said something
13	different from what's written because we don't know
14	which version is the more correct. So if at any point
15	your witnesses stumble or notice something in the
16	written statement that they're saying different because
17	they've updated it it will help if they either back up
18	and go over what they're saying, strike that, for
19	example, and read it again correctly or identify that
20	they are changing what's in the written document so that
21	we'll know which to rely on. But I have no objection to
22	having that information in the record twice, that is in
23	the transcript and as an exhibit.
24	MR. MONAHAN: Thank you, Your Honor. With
25	that, what we're envisioning is really an informal
	York Stenographic Services, Inc.

1	presentation. I will not be making advocate's speeches.
2	I will not be conducting direct examinations. It's just
3	going to be a really follow-up on the grass roots
4	approach that brought us to today's presentation, Your
5	Honor.
6	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: All right.
7	Thank you, Mr. Monahan. Before you begin, Mr. Moody.
8	MR. MOODY: Thank you, Your Honor.
9	Brendan, can we have those written statements before
10	they begin their testimony so we can save time on cross-
11	examination?
12	MR. MONAHAN: Your Honor, in reading through
13	the CFR regulations that govern the submission of
14	written statements, I advised and instructed each member
15	of the committee to bring four copies of their written
16	statements. And I'll do a little head check now to see
17	how many people follow our rules. How many people here
18	have written statements? I'll gather those right now,
19	Your Honor.
20	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: All right.
21	Good. Let's go off record and everyone in the room may
22	take a stretch break for five minutes while we do this
23	distribution.
24	***

25 [Off the record.]

1	[On the record.]
2	***
3	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: We're back on
4	record now at 10:48. Mr. Monahan, you may proceed.
5	MR. MONAHAN: Thank you, Your Honor. While
6	we were off the record I pre-marked Exhibits 7 through
7	14 and I have provided copies to the court reporter, to
8	general counsel and to Mr. Moody. I would like just to
9	take a moment and identify what those exhibits are
10	before we proceed with the oral testimony.
11	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: You may.
12	MR. MONAHAN: Exhibit 7 is the are the
13	remarks of Mr. Carpenter Steve Carpenter, who will be
14	the first witness. Exhibit 8 is actually deferred or
15	reserved, Your Honor. We would ask to be able to
16	supplement the record tomorrow with a hard copy printout
17	of the slide presentation that Mr. Smith will be making
18	in a few moments. Exhibit 9 are the comments of Ken
19	Desserault. Exhibit 10, comments of Dan Newhouse.
20	Exhibit 11 is the presentation of Reggie Brulotte.
21	Exhibit 12, presentation of Leslie Roy. Exhibit 13 is
22	the prepared text of Tom Gasseling. And Exhibit 14 is
23	Duane Desserault's presentation, Your Honor.
24	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: All right. I
25	assume that Ken and Duane spell their last names the
	York Stenographic Services, Inc.

1	same.
2	MR. MONAHAN: They do.
3	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: And both of
4	those last names end in a t as in Tom.
5	MR. MONAHAN: Correct.
6	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Okay. All
7	right. Good. Now, I know there were limited duplicate
8	copies. Are those counsel in the room who need a copy
9	in possession of one? Is there anyone that didn't get a
10	copy that would like a copy at the next break when a
11	copy might be produced? All right. It looks like they
12	stretched far enough. Now, there's one reason why you
13	might want to make one additional duplicate and that
14	would be when the court reporter sends in the tapes at
15	the end of the day, he could enclose a copy of those for
16	the typist to be guided as she listens to the tape in
17	typing what was said. It just would make it easier for
18	the typist. So if, at a break, lunch break or whatever,
19	some time before the end of the day when the tapes go,
20	if you could duplicate those statements for the typist
21	that would just help.
22	MR. MONAHAN: We will do so, Your Honor.
23	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: All right.
24	Good. All right. Then you may call your first witness.
25	MR. MONAHAN: Thank you, Your Honor. With
	York Stenographic Services, Inc.

1	that, the Proponents' Committee would call its first
2	witness, Mr. Stephen Carpenter.
3	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Would you again
4	state and spell your names for us?
5	MR. CARPENTER: My name is Stephen Carpenter.
6	S-t-e-p-h-e-n C-a-r-p-e-n-t-e-r.
7	***
8	[Witness sworn]
9	***
10	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Mr. Monahan, you
11	may proceed. Do you have any preliminary questions
12	before the witness begins?
13	MR. MONAHAN: I do not, Your Honor. Again,
14	as I mentioned, we are going to make this a fairly
15	informal presentation. I do not intend to conduct
16	direct examinations. If perhaps a witness gets lost or
17	flustered, I may speak up to try to get them back on
18	track. But this is the Proponents their own
19	proposal, Your Honor.
20	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: All right.
21	Thank you. Mr. Carpenter, you may proceed.
22	MR. CARPENTER: Thank you, Your Honor. On
23	behalf of the Hop Marketing Order Proponents Committee,
24	we would like to extend our appreciation to the United
25	States Department of Agriculture for the opportunity to
	York Stenographic Services, Inc.

1	defend our proposal for a Federal marking order in a
2	formal public forum. This process began almost two
3	years ago in the wake of severe economic hardship
4	brought on, in part, by a chronic oversupply situation
5	and in the wake of several voluntary industry efforts to
6	bring supply back in line with demand. In November of
7	2001, the Hop Growers of America appointed a taskforce,
8	which became known as the Production Management Team, to
9	study the problem of chronic oversupply and to provide a
10	recommendation to the industry at the 2002 HGA
11	Convention in Salishan, Oregon. A series of meetings
12	were held throughout the Pacific Northwest in order to
13	gather input from the grower community. The meetings
14	were well attended and a consensus was developed on
15	several key issues. First of all, the program must be
16	mandatory with penalties for non-compliance. Secondly,
17	the benefits and the cost must accrue equitably across
18	the industry. And thirdly, our input from the Oregon
19	growers was that they requested that Washington growers
20	take a leadership role in addressing the situation. The
21	production management team took this information and
22	developed a two-part recommendation that was presented
23	to the industry at the 2002 HGA Convention. Phase I of
24	the recommendation Washington would take a leadership
25	role in reducing production by pursuing the
	York Stenographic Services, Inc.

implementation of the set aside program, which would
provide financial incentive for growers to leave acreage
unstrung for the 2002 crop funded by a special
assessment. Phase II, a proponents committee would be
formed to pursue the development of a federal marketing
order for hops. In February of 2002, a proponents
committee was formed and a new series of industry
meetings were initiated in Oregon, Idaho and Washington
to solicit input into the features of a proposal for a
federal marketing order. At that time, the services of
Ag Management and Rod Christiansen were secured by the
Proponents Committee. Concurrent with Proponents
Committee activity, the Washington State Department of
Agriculture was petitioned to begin the process of
allowing a referendum on the set aside program. Private
contracts were agreed to among a majority of Washington
growers, ensuring participatory support for setting
aside 6000 acres of 2002 production and support for a
subsequent referendum. On May 1, 2002, the prerequisite
minimum commitment of 6000 acres was reached and on May
6, 2002, the acting director of the Washington State
Department of Agriculture recommended that the set aside
proposal go to referendum. On May 30, 2002, the
decision was reversed and the referendum was denied
effectively too late for growers to string acres
York Stenographic Services, Inc.

1	committed to the program. Meanwhile, the Proponents
2	Committee's activities continued. In July 2002, a first
3	draft of a proposed federal marketing order was
4	presented to the industry and another round of industry
5	meetings were held to hear input. After modifications
6	based on this input or incorporated, the proposal was
7	submitted to the USDA on October 7, 2002. This entire
8	process has been open, inclusive and represents a
9	sincere effort to develop a consensus on a proposal,
10	which will give the industry a tool to use to bring some
11	much needed stability to our struggling industry. We
12	firmly believe that a health hop industry is in the best
13	interest of growers, merchants and especially our
14	customers. It is a sincere wish of the Proponents
15	Committee that the proceedings over the next few days
16	are fruitful, the debate remain open and honest, and
17	above all, civil, as we discuss the proposed federal
18	marketing order for hops.
19	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Thank you,
20	Mr. Carpenter.
21	MR. MONAHAN: Your Honor.
22	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Mr. Monahan.
23	* * *
24	STEPHEN CARPENTER,
25	having first been duly sworn, according to the law,
	York Stenographic Services, Inc.
	34 North George St., York, PA 17401 - (717) 854-0077

1	testified as follows:
2	BY MR. MONAHAN:
3	Q. There is one question I have
4	Mr. Carpenter. You had discussed the Hop Growers of
5	America's role in the initial stages of the hop
6	marketing order. Can you please tell the or describe
7	for those assembled the role of Hop Growers of America
8	in the hop industry?
9	A. Hop Growers of America would be our
10	national growers organization. They are represented by
11	growers in Washington, Oregon and Idaho. They really
12	play no role in the marketing order itself, but the
13	predecessor of the Proponents Committee came from a
14	taskforce commissioned by the HGA.
15	Q. With Your Honor's permission, I'd like to
16	approach Mr. Carpenter and hand him a document that I
17	have marked as Exhibit 15.
18	***
19	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: You may.
20	***
21	BY MR. MONAHAN:
22	Q. And Your Honor, through oversight, I just
23	found that exhibit in my briefcase. I would like to
24	I don't have copies for everybody. I would like to ask
25	Mr. Carpenter to review it, describe it for the record.
	York Stenographic Services, Inc.
	34 North George St., York, PA 17401 - (717) 854-0077

1	I will not move for its admission until I've had the
2	opportunity to make copies and provide them to counsel.
3	Okay. With that, Mr. Carpenter, do you recognize
4	Exhibit 15?
5	A. This was a document created early on in
6	the process to identify the problem of chronic
7	oversupply.
8	Q. Who prepared it?
9	A. It was I'm not sure specifically who,
10	but it was prepared under the auspices, I believe, of
11	the production management team.
12	Q. Okay. And that was at the first stages
13	of trying to
14	A. Correct.
15	Qunderstand whether a hop marketing
16	order was appropriate?
17	A. That's correct.
18	Q. Okay. I have nothing further, Your
19	Honor.
20	***
21	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: All right. With
22	regard to cross-examining this witness, I think with
23	regard to the document that's been marked as Exhibit 15,
24	we ought to recall this witness for that purpose. Do
25	you agree, Mr. Monahan?

1	MR. MONAHAN: He'll be available for the
2	duration of the proceedings, Your Honor.
3	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Okay. Good. So
4	don't concern yourselves with a document you haven't
5	seen yet, but with regard to Mr. Carpenter's prepared
6	statement, which he has read into the record, is there
7	any cross-examination? Mr. Moody?
8	* * *
9	BY MR. MOODY:
10	Q. Thank you, Your Honor. Mr. Carpenter,
11	you identified a problem, which you characterize as
12	chronic oversupply. Is that correct?
13	A. That is correct.
14	Q. Okay. And is that by that do you mean
15	can you give a little bit more information about what
16	you mean by chronic oversupply?
17	A. I think we'll probably get into the meat
18	of the numbers with our next presentation and subsequent
19	presentations. But as an industry, we've had this
20	inventory that's kind of hung over our heads that has
21	contributed to poor economic conditions.
22	Q. All right. Is one of the purposes of the
23	federal marketing order proposal to increase the price
24	of hops?
25	A. No.
	York Stenographic Services, Inc.
	34 North George St., York, PA 17401 - (717) 854-0077

1	Q. Okay. What is the expected price impact
2	of a proposal if any?
3	A. Well, the proposal is designed to manage
4	the oversupply. And obviously, if that means that
5	prices get closer to parity, then that's a way to
6	measure success.
7	Q. Okay. So do you intend the proposal to
8	have an effect on grower price?
9	A. Indirectly, yes.
10	Q. Okay. And what's the for example, I
11	noticed that inflation adjusted price for '02 the last
12	year for which USDA has data here was \$1.75 a pound. Is
13	that correct?
14	A. I don't know.
15	Q. All right. Well, any the nominal
16	price, the price in dollars you received that year from
17	'02 was \$1.94 a pound. Is that correct as far as you
18	know?
19	A. I have no idea.
20	***
21	MR. MONAHAN: Jim, are you asking
22	MR. CARPENTER: I don't have that.
23	MR. MOODY: If you have that I don't
24	know if you have a copy of the exhibit the USDA data
25	exhibit, Exhibit 5?
	Vork Stenographic Services, Inc.

1	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: The court
2	reporter can hand it to him.
3	MR. MOODY: And if you could look,
4	Mr. Carpenter, at
5	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Just a moment,
6	Mr. Moody. I had asked the court reporter to hand the
7	witness Exhibit 5 please.
8	THE REPORTER: Exhibit 5?
9	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Yes, please.
10	MR. MOODY: Right. And Table 1 the
11	second page of Table 1.
12	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Thank you.
13	MR. CARPENTER: I have the document in front of
14	me. What is it you
15	* * *
16	BY MR. MOODY:
17	Q. Okay. The second page of Table 1, the
18	last line there for 2002. It says the grower price was
19	\$1.94 a pound for that year.
20	A. Right.
21	Q. Is that correct to the best of your
22	knowledge?
23	A. That's what the document indicates.
24	Q. Well, do you have any reason to differ
25	with that \$1.94?

1	A. No.
2	Q. Is that a fair approximation of what your
3	returns were for that year?
4	A. I have no way of answering that unless I
5	can go back to my records.
6	Q. All right. And then what then is the
7	Proponents Committees price objective under the federal
8	proposal?
9	A. I don't think there's ever been a price
10	objective established. We want to manage the oversupply
11	situation.
12	Q. Okay. Do you have a price target in
13	mind, setting the supply at a particular level that
14	would produce a particular price?
15	A. No. We do not.
16	Q. Do you have a particular target in mind
17	as far as the supply objective?
18	A. Not at this point. As a Proponents
19	Committee, our job is to put together a tool. I think
20	perhaps you're getting into questions that an
21	administrative committee are going to have to address as
22	some point. The Proponents Committee our job was to
23	put together a tool based on input from the industry,
24	which we tried to accomplish.
25	Q. All right. Well, what methodology would
	York Stenographic Services, Inc.

1	be used to fix the appropriate level of production for
2	each season?
3	A. The administrative committee will
4	establish a saleable on an annual basis.
5	Q. But that represents a production target.
6	Is that correct?
7	A. That is not correct.
8	Q. Okay. But the first thing the committee
9	is going to do is to decide what the production should
10	be for the next calendar year or the next production
11	year.
12	A. That is incorrect.
13	Q. Okay. What's the first what's the
14	in dealing with this oversupply problem supposed
15	oversupply problem what's the committee's first task?
16	A. Well, their task is to establish a
17	saleable on an annual basis.
18	Q. Okay. And a saleable is a percentage of
19	the base.
20	A. Correct.
21	Q. Okay. And the base times the saleable
22	gives you a figure. Correct?
23	A. Would you repeat that please?
24	Q. Base times the saleable gives you a

figure in pounds.

25

1	A. Correct.
2	Q. And that figure in pounds represents
3	what?
4	A. What can be sold into the trade.
5	Q. Okay. And is that would it be fair to
6	say that's the supply?
7	A. The supply that is made available to the
8	trade. Correct.
9	Q. Yes. Plus carryover.
10	A. Plus carryover?
11	Q. Yes.
12	A. I guess inventory would have to be a
13	figure that would be incorporated into the committee's
14	decision.
15	Q. Okay. So the supply for the upcoming
16	season would be the saleable times the base plus the
17	carryover. Is that correct?
18	A. Yes.
19	Q. Okay. Then what methodology would be
20	employed to determine the supply target?
21	A. I would think that the administrative
22	committee would have to have some type of records of
23	what the inventory is, what the production is and what
24	the perceived demand is.
25	Q. Okay. I notice that the production for York Stenographic Services, Inc.

1	2002 was 58,336 pounds. Is that correct?
2	***
3	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Where are you
4	looking, Mr. Moody?
5	MR. MOODY: I'm looking at the 2002 line,
6	the third column.
7	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Which page of
8	Exhibit 5?
9	MR. MOODY: It's page 2. All right. Would
10	that be 58,336,000 pounds?
11	MR. CARPENTER: That's correct.
12	MR. MOODY: Okay. Now, is that was that
13	figure for that year, given the methodology you've just
14	outlined, too large or too small or just about right?
15	MR. CARPENTER: I have no way, as an
16	individual, of determining that.
17	MR. MOODY: Okay. What methodology would
18	be employed to determine that?
19	MR. CARPENTER: Well, you would need to know
20	what demand is. You would need to know what supply is.
21	And you would need to know what the inventory is.
22	MR. MOODY: Okay. Why don't you work out
23	for me using 2002 data and employing the methodology
24	you're proposing what the saleable would be for 2002?
25	MR. MONAHAN: Your Honor, I'd object I'd
	York Stenographic Services, Inc.

1	object to the question, Your Honor. I think that this
2	witness has already testified that that is something
3	that the administrative committee will have to address
4	once it is convened if there is an order actually in
5	place.
6	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: The objection is
7	noted, Mr. Monahan, but the witness may answer the
8	question.
9	MR. CARPENTER: Would you repeat the question?
10	***
11	BY MR. MOODY:
12	Q. Yes. Employing the methodology you
13	proposed, could you work out for me what the saleable
14	would be for 2002?
15	A. As an individual I cannot. I don't have
16	enough information.
17	Q. Okay. What information do you lack you
18	need in order to
19	A. Well, I need the actual numbers.
20	Q. Okay. Well, aren't they contained in
21	this data table?
22	A. No.
23	Q. Okay. What's missing from the data
24	table?
25	A. Well, I don't think a demand figure is
	York Stenographic Services, Inc.

1	included in there.
2	Q. Okay. Would you get that for 2002
3	where would you get that from?
4	A. Well, you know, I'm not here to comment
5	on the methodologies that the administrative committee
6	might make. It's their decision. It's their job to
7	find that out. I would think that there would be
8	there's plenty of industry publications that estimate
9	demand. I would think that that would go into the
10	process as well. But that's up for the administrative
11	committee to decide and we represent the Proponents
12	Committee here today.
13	Q. Right. Well, one of the things one of
14	the questions this hearing is to explore is how the
15	order would work in practice. And so since 2002 is long
16	since past and the data is, you know, in the barn, I
17	think it's a fair question to ask how, under the
18	Proponents' proposal, the saleable would be calculated
19	for that year since you have all the figures for 2002.
20	A. I do not have all the figures.
21	Q. Okay. What are you lacking?
22	A. I am lacking demand figures.
23	Q. Okay. And but you have on the data
24	tables here you have figures for consumption for

25

2002.

1	A. Where are those at?
2	Q. Okay. Let's look at if I could ask
3	you to look, Mr. Carpenter, at Table 7.
4	A. I don't see a consumption figure there
5	for 2002.
6	Q. Okay. Let me looking back on 2002
7	season, under the Proponents' proposal, how would demand
8	be calculated?
9	***
10	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: I think he
11	answered that one, Mr. Moody. He indicated that the
12	administrative committee would utilize data that was
13	published
14	MR. MOODY: Okay. And that's
15	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE:and reached
16	that conclusion.
17	MR. MOODY: Right. And that's, I guess,
18	what I'm trying to get at is how would the order operate
19	in practice. What data would the use? Because since a
20	saleable is a function of demand it's very important to
21	know how demand would be calculated because one person
22	might think it's 50 million pounds and one person might
23	think it's 100 million pounds.
24	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: I guess to
25	answer your question, Mr. Moody, it would operate very
	York Stenographic Services, Inc.

1	similar to the administrative committee's decision
2	making in the prior order in determining what the
3	saleable is going to be on an annual basis. The goal to
4	bring stability to the industry and I think it would
5	function very similarly I'm speculating a little bit
6	here but I think it would function very similarly to
7	the administrative committee in the prior order.
8	Q. Okay. And where would the committee get
9	the data to determine this demand figure?
10	A. Various publications, inquiries to
11	customers. Again, they would use, I would assume, the
12	same methodology that the prior administrative committee
13	used to establish the saleable.
14	Q. Okay. Well, do you have any kind of an
15	opinion as to what the saleable should have been for
16	2002 if it would have been in operation?
17	A. I have not.
18	Q. Do you have any idea what the demand was
19	for 2002?
20	A. I do not.
21	Q. All right. Do you in your own
22	production, do you have a chronic oversupply in your own
23	production of hops?
24	A. On my farm?
25	Q. Yes, sir.
	York Stenographic Services, Inc.

1	75	VI -
1	Α.	No.
2	Q.	Well, where in the industry is the
3	overproduction	occurring?
4	Α.	It's occurring across the industry. I
5	think we see	e it in prices and it's obvious it occurs
6	across the ind	ustry.
7	Q.	Well, how it is that the industry is
8	overproduced b	ut not you?
9	Α.	We are not overproduced on our farm.
10	Q.	Okay. Then getting back to my previous
11	question, how	would we find out where the in the
12	industry the c	hronic overproduction is occurring, among
13	which group of	growers or which region or whatever.
14	Where is that	overproduction taking place?
15	Α.	I don't know if I can answer that
16	specifically.	I don't know enough about each grower's
17	specific opera	tion to know. I don't think I can answer
18	that.	
19	Q.	Well, how do you know the industry is in
20	a state of chr	onic overproduction as a whole?
21	Α.	Well, I think the numbers show that we
22	have produced	more hops as an industry than what the
23	market needs.	I think we'll be getting into that in
24	subsequent tes	timony.
25	Q.	Okay. Are hops that are in excess of
		York Stenographic Services, Inc.

1	what the "market needs" destroyed?
2	A. No.
3	Q. What happens to those excess hops over,
4	let's say, the last five years or so?
5	A. They sit in warehouses.
6	Q. Okay. Now, in what form do they sit in
7	warehouse?
8	A. Raw hops, pellets, extract, all forms.
9	Q. Okay. And then what happens to the hops
10	after they've been in the warehouse for a time?
11	A. What happens to the hops?
12	Q. Yes. Are they eventually destroyed,
13	thrown out, fed to cattle, sold to brewers?
14	A. All of the above.
15	Q. Okay. Let's focus on the waste for a
16	moment. What situations can you give as far as hops
17	that have actually be thrown out of disposed of?
18	A. I think some older aroma crops get to the
19	point where they're unmarketable.
20	Q. Okay. Do you have any data on the
21	quantity of hops?
22	A. I do not.
23	Q. Do you know of any data sources?
24	A. No.
25	Q. Okay. Isn't it true that most of the

1	hops stored in the warehouse are eventually sold to
2	brewers and dealers?
3	A. That is true.
4	Q. Okay. Then would you characterize a sale
5	of those hops as an example of chronic oversupply?
6	A. I think the fact that the hops are there
7	in the beginning certainly has a detrimental effect on
8	return back to grower and has really a devastating
9	effect on our industry. We see growers who are no
10	longer growers who are, you know, going back to school
11	to become teachers. And that's the type of thing
12	that's one of the goals that the committee put together
13	was try to stabilize the industry so that those that
14	want to remain profitable growing hops can.
15	Q. Isn't it true that hops can be
16	efficiently stored in a warehouse and be marketed in a
17	subsequent year?
18	A. That is true.
19	Q. And isn't it true that brewers and
20	dealers also store hops for multiple years?
21	A. That is true.
22	Q. Aren't there several forms that hops can
23	be stored in?
24	A. Yes.
25	Q. And what's the in your view, what's
	York Stenographic Services, Inc.

1	the most efficient way to store the hops?
2	A. The most efficient way to store hops?
3	Q. Um-hum.
4	A. Probably as extract. Probably the most
5	stable form of storage is extract.
6	Q. All right. And do you store have you
7	in the past, stored some of your own production in
8	warehouses?
9	A. Yes.
10	Q. As extract?
11	A. Yes.
12	Q. Okay. And is there an approximate
13	figure? Do you store five, 10 percent of your
14	production in warehouse or is there some kind of
15	historical amount you've stored?
16	A. I don't have those figures available.
17	No.
18	Q. All right. So and by storing those
19	hops in the warehouse doesn't that give you an
20	opportunity to respond to spot market purchases?
21	A. Could you be more specific?
22	Q. Yes. The fact that you've got hops
23	stored in a warehouse doesn't that give you a chance to
24	exploit opportunities that come along in the spot
25	market?

1	Α.	A grower who has inventory when the
2	market needs i	t certainly has the ability to take
3		he market over a grower that doesn't.
4	Q.	Is there some optimum level of storage
5	that would not	constitute a chronic oversupply?
6	Α.	Would you repeat that please?
7	Q.	Yes. There is some level of storage or
8	grower invento	ry that in your view would not be a
9	chronic oversu	
10	Α.	Well, I would think that there would be
I 1	an operational	inventory that would per se, that you
12		have to take care of short-term needs of
13	customers.	
14	Q.	And what should that figure be?
15	Α.	I don't know.
16	Q.	How would you figure it out?
17	Α.	How would I determine what that figure
18	is?	
19	Q.	Um-hum.
20	Α.	You would have to estimate demand and
21	estimate suppl	y and come up with a figure.
22	Q.	Okay. And would that process of
23	estimating dem	and be the similar process to what you
24	described befo	re in setting a saleable?
25	Α.	I would think you would need to have
		York Stenographic Services, Inc.

I	those figures together.
2	Q. For the 2002 period then, in your view,
3	what would be the optimum level of inventory?
4	A. I can't answer that question. I don't
5	have all the figures in front of me and it's not my job
6	any way. It would be the job of a duly elected
7	administrative committee.
8	Q. Well, but you're, as a Proponent
9	representative, proposing a methodology to employ a
10	formula, if you will, to get at that figure and that's
i 1	what I'm trying to explore as to what that formula would
12	be in using historical data what result that formula
13	would produce.
14	A. Actually, the Proponents Committee is not
15	proposing a methodology. We're proposing that it be the
16	job of the administrative committee to come up with
17	those figures. It's not our job to do the
18	administrative committee's job.
19	Q. Oh, I see. So there's no one no
20	witness that you know that's going to present using
21	historical data how the marketing order would have
22	operated had it been in place?
23	A. Not to my knowledge.
24	Q. All right. The supply variability from
25	year to year is that due to changes in weather

1	conditions in part?
2	A. That would be a factor.
3	Q. And do you think the production
4	variability from year to year has been the
5	variability now has been, in any way, unreasonable?
6	A. Unreasonable?
7	Q. Yes.
8	A. In what way?
9	Q. That's my question for you. Do you thin}
10	there's been too much variability from year to year?
11	A. That's a subjective term and I have no
12	opinion. I don't know.
13	Q. All right. Do you think the price
14	fluctuations from year to year have been unreasonably
15	variable?
16	A. I think from an industry standpoint they
17	have been.
18	Q. Okay. What is the in your view, what
19	is a reasonable level of price fluctuation from season
20	to season?
21	A. I really have no opinion.
22	Q. All right. And I think you indicated
23	earlier that you had no price target under your
24	proposal. Is that correct?
25	A. That's correct.

1	Q. Now, your own operation now, have you
2	been an expanding producer or a reducing a declining
3	producer in terms of your acreage?
4	A. Over what period of time?
5	Q. Going back to 1997.
6	A. On our particular operation I believe
7	we're about the same size, perhaps have reduced
8	marginally.
9	Q. Okay. And what's the name of your farm?
10	A. Carpenter Farms.
11	Q. Carpenter Farms. So you've reduced your
12	acreage slightly in that period of time?
13	A. Yeah. I you know, without having 1
14	didn't come here prepared with my production figures to
15	answer your question, but I think in general about the
16	same level of '97, perhaps a little smaller.
17	Q. Okay. Have you worked out under your
18	proposal what your base would be?
19	A. No. I have not.
20	Q. Now, your how many well, how many
21	production entities are you involved in or how many
22	production entities are you connected with?
23	A. Personally?
24	Q. Yes.
25	A. I own a minority share in one production

1	entity.
2	Q. Okay. That's Carpenter Farms?
3	A. That's correct.
4	Q. Okay. And what's Carpenter Brothers?
5	A. That is an entity owned by my father and
6	another gentleman.
7	Q. Okay. And you have no economic interest
8	in that?
9	A. I have none.
10	Q. Okay. And what's Yakima Chief Partners?
11	A. I have no idea.
12	Q. Okay. So under your proposal, you'd have
13	one vote as a grower.
14	A. Well, I think we've got on the schedule
15	later on I think the committee is in the process of
16	formulating a proposal for voting and I would prefer to
17	defer that to a later time.
18	* * *
19	MR. MONAHAN: Just for purposes of
20	clarification, Jim, are you asking about a subsequent
21	referendum?
22	***
23	BY MR. MOODY:
24	Q. Yes. All right. Now, Mr. Carpenter,
25	you've we're in the '03 how you measured the '03
	York Stenographic Services, Inc.

:		
	1	season. Is that correct?
	2	A. Have I measured
	3	Q. No. It's correct to describe the present
	4	season as the '03 season.
	5	A. That's correct.
	6	Q. Okay. And growers in this industry are
	7	given a grower number to identify them as a unique
	8	grower. Is that correct?
	9	A. That is correct.
	10	Q. All right. Now, is it true that you've
	11	transferred some of your hops to people with other
	12	grower numbers for this season?
	13	***
	14	MR. MONAHAN: Your Honor, I would just object
	15	to this line of questioning. Seems like we've gone very
	16	far off field from the scope of the direct examination.
	17	There will be a presentation by the Proponents'
	18	Committee as to our suggestions and thoughts as to how a
	19	subsequent referendum should be conducted. But I
	20	believe we're a little far off field in the cross-
	21	examination.
	22	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: I'm going to
	23	allow wide latitude on cross-examination while a
	24	particular witness is here. Each grower is an expert in
	25	his own way. And if Mr. Moody can obtain information
_		York Stenographic Services, Inc.
		34 North George St., York, PA 17401 - (717) 854-0077

from each one that's fine with me or any other crossexaminer. However, I never have cautioned you all that
some of the questions that may be asked may be relevant
but you are not required to reveal the information
because it's proprietary. And I'm sensing that you
might be getting close there, Mr. Moody. So at any
point if anyone feels you're being asked to divulge
something that would put you at a competitive
disadvantage you are not required to answer that
question.

1

2

3

4

5

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Your Honor, this line of MR. MOODY: questioning actually will become relevant as we flush it out with other testifiers, but it will -- since there's only approximately 200 growers in this industry and since the no count is about 50 percent or would vote no in the referendum, at this point there is quite -- will be quite a contention as to who's eligible to vote as a grower. And it's not unique in this program. It came up in pork and it came up in sheep. And when a vote is anticipated to be fairly close, trying to figure out who's a grower and who's eligible to vote, you know, could turn out to be outcome determinative of the referendum. And because of some things that have happened in the last couple seasons I need to explore that with each of the witnesses to show the potential York Stenographic Services, Inc.

1	risks associated with the rules for voting.
2	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: All right. Now,
3	how does the referendum issue relate to what's before me
4	here?
5	MR. MOODY: Well, one of the definitions in
6	the order is who is a grower. And a grower a
7	producer ultimately will have a right to vote in a
8	referendum. And so it turns out to be quite important
9	to know in an objective way who a grower is so that when
10	the referendum is eventually conducted, if it's
11	conducted, there is an objective way to determine who's
12	eligible to vote and who isn't. Kind of like a
13	residency requirement in a precinct. You know you have
14	to find out for sure if someone lives there or they
15	don't in order to determine whether they're qualified to
16	vote.
17	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: All right.
18	Thank you. I understand now. You may proceed, Mr.
19	Moody. Do you remember your last question?
20	MR. MOODY: I'll just ask it again if
21	that's all right, Your Honor.
22	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: You may.
23	***
24	BY MR. MOODY:
25	Q. All right. For the '03 season, did you
	York Stenographic Services, Inc.

1	transfer some of your bales of hops to other grower
2	numbers?
3	A. Some of the bales of Carpenter Farms'
4	hops to other grower numbers?
5	Q. Yes.
6	A. No. And I would just like to state I
7	agree with your statements that the entire issue of the
8	referendum and who gets to vote and who doesn't is very
9	important. And I think the Proponents Committee
10	recognizes that and I think we will have some proposals
11	later on in that regard and perhaps that would be a good
12	time for questioning to occur on those issues.
13	Q. Do you know who LB Farms is?
14	A. No. I don't.
15	Q. SP Farms?
16	A. Yes.
17	Q. And were some of the hops produced on
18	your land assigned to their grower number?
19	A. No.
20	Q. Donald Riel?
21	A. I know who Don Riel is.
22	Q. And same question. Were some of your
23	hops reported under his grower number?
24	A. No.
25	Q. Darryl Riel?

1	A. I don't know that I've met Darryl.												
2	Q. Stepping Pea?												
3	A. No.												
4	***												
5	MR. MONAHAN: Your Honor, he did answer the												
6	question that none of his hops were assigned to other												
7	growers. I don't know if we need to go through a												
8	laundry list and answer no each time.												
9	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Mr. Moody may												
10	want to just jog the witness's memory in the event he												
11	may have overlooked something. I trust you're not going												
12	to take a lot of time at this, Mr. Moody.												
13	MR. MOODY: No. There's only seven												
14	growers, Your Honor.												
15	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: All right. You												
16	may proceed.												
17	* * *												
18	BY MR. MOODY:												
19	Q. Stepping Pea, Inc.?												
20	A. No.												
21	Q. Henry Tobin?												
22	A. Are you asking if you know these growers?												
23	Q. Yes.												
24	A. I know Hank Tobin.												
25	Q. And were any of your hops reported under												
	York Stenographic Services, Inc.												

1	his grower number?
2	A. No.
3	Q. And the last one is Chiefton Acres? Do
4	you know that grower?
5	A. I am not sure, but I am sure none of our
6	hops were delivered under his grower number.
7	Q. Okay. And for your Carpenter Farms
8	Operation did you have any leasehold interests in
9	connection with other growers for this season?
10	A. No.
11	Q. You described a situation where there was
12	a set aside, I think you said, of 6000 acres for the '02
13	season. Is that correct?
14	A. That's correct.
15	Q. And was that acreage all in Washington
16	State?
17	A. That's correct.
18	Q. And when you use the term set aside does
19	that mean that hops weren't produced on those acres for
20	that season?
21	A. That's hops were produced but not
22	strung or potentially produced but not strung.
23	Q. Okay. Meaning exactly what?
24	A. I believe the set aside program required
25	for growers to be eligible and this was a proposed

1	program and never did go to fruition but I believe
2	the program was set up so that people were eligible for
3	a set aside financial incentive if they did not string
4	hops in other words, if they did not put twine in the
5	fields for the 2002 crop.
6	Q. Okay. And what's the significance of
7	stringing hops? If you could just briefly explain that
8	role in production?
9	***
10	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Hold that
11	question. We'll change tapes.
12	***
13	[Off the record.]
14	[On the record.]
15	***
16	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: We're back on
17	record at 11:33. Mr. Moody, will you ask that question
18	again?
19	***
20	BY MR. MOODY:
21	Q. Yes. What's the significance of
22	stringing hops in terms of their production and harvest?
23	A. Hops are a perennial crop and on an
24	annual basis in order to facilitate an easier harvest a
25	string is put from a plant generally up to an 18 to 20
	York Stenographic Services, Inc.
	34 North George St., York, PA 17401 - (717) 854-0077

- foot trellis wire and the hops are grown up that string.
- 2 And it helps to facilitate the harvest of those plants
- 3 to have them on the string.
- Q. Okay. So if hops aren't strung they
- 5 can't be harvested.
- A. That's not correct. Hops can be
- 7 harvested without stringing.
- 8 Q. But the yield is significantly less.
- A. I don't know if it's significantly less,
- 10 but it's certainly harder to harvest.
- 0. Okay. So for the 6000 acres of hops that
- 12 were -- would the right word be signed up for or
- 13 contracted for -- is it correct that that 6000 acres
- 14 wasn't strung?
- 15 A. That is correct.
- 16 Q. Now, were hops harvested from those 6000
- 17 acres?
- A. Not to my knowledge.
- 19 Q. Okay. And what was the -- how did you
- 20 determine that 6000 acres was the correct amount for the
- 21 set aside?
- A. I'm not sure the 6000 acres -- the reason
- 23 the 6000 acres was correct for the set aside is that was
- 24 the estimation that the production management team came
- 25 up with.

1	Q. Okay. And how did they make that
2	estimate? I mean why wasn't it 5000 or 7000?
3	A. I think there was an effort to
4	communicate with merchants and to communicate with
5	others in the industry to come up with an estimation.
6	Q. And what was the goal of that 6000 acres
7	set aside?
8	A. The goal was to take some hops out of
9	production for the 2002 year.
10	Q. All right. And was that expected to have
11	a price impact?
12	A. I'm not sure if that was a goal. It was
13	simply meant to take some production out and to provide
14	an economic incentive for growers to do so.
15	Q. Okay. Did that 6000 set aside acres have
16	a price impact on that year?
17	A. I can't answer that question. I don't
18	know.
19	Q. Let me direct your attention to the USDA
20	data table, Exhibit 5. And I think it's Table 1A, the
21	last row Table 1A, which has got the inflation adjusted
22	grower prices. And I would call your attention to the
23	figures in the right-hand column for the '01 season
24	or the '00 season at \$1.75. The '01 season
25	***
	Varis Stangaranhia Sarriaga Ing

1	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Just a minute,
2	Mr. Moody. What page are you looking on?
3	MR. MOODY: It's page 4.
4	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Page 4. Okay.
5	Wait just a minute. Okay. Start again looking at page
6	4.
7	MR. MOODY: Okay. The three numbers in the
8	bottom of the right-hand column for the '00, '01 and '02
9	seasons, \$1.75 a pound for each of those seasons.
10	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Okay. We're
11	looking at that.
12	***
13	BY MR. MOODY:
14	Q. Okay. Mr. Carpenter, isn't it correct to
15	say that that 6000 acres set aside did not have any
16	impact on price for the '02 season?
17	A. I can't say whether it did or whether it
18	not. Our season average prices are a combination of
19	prices for aroma hops, alpha hops. You've got
20	fluctuating demands for both varieties. So I can't
21	really tell you, as an individual witness, whether it
22	had an impact on price or not. There's too many factors
23	to look at.
24	Q. Should that 6000 acres have been higher?
25	Was it too low in your view?
	York Stenographic Services, Inc.
	34 North George St. Vork PA 17401 - (717) 854-0077

1	A. I have no way of determining one way of
2	the other.
3	Q. Were these 6000 acres a variety of alpha
4	and aroma hops?
5	A. I believe there was no requirement by
6	those eligible for the set aside to indicate whether it
7	was aroma hops or alpha hops that was coming out of
8	production.
9	Q. Okay. So you don't you couldn't tell
10	me out of that 6000 acres how much of it was aroma type
11	hops?
12	A. I don't recall ever seeing that
13	information. I'm not sure it was available. But I'm
14	sure I didn't see it if it was.
15	Q. Okay. Now, did in examining the
16	potential impact of the marketing order did you run some
17	scenarios on what the saleable would likely be for the
18	first few years of operation?
19	A. I have not. One piece of information you
20	would need, of course, is to know what everybody's base
21	allotment would be. The Proponents Committee or the
22	Production Management Team, I can't remember which one,
23	attempted to do a survey whereby growers would
24	participate on a confidential basis in submitting
25	information so that we could do that. We could run some
	York Stenographic Services, Inc.

1 ·	scenarios. And we got good participation from										
2	Washington, fairly good participation from Oregon, but										
3	we didn't feel we had enough information to really										
4	project saleables.										
5	Q. Now, you looked at the comparative impact										
6	of the order on a declining producer versus an expanding										
7	producer. Is that correct?										
8	A. Yes. We have.										
9	Q. Okay. Isn't it true that there are										
10	since the '97 season that some there have been										
11	producers who are expanding their acreage? Is that										
12	correct?										
13	A. I would assume that would be correct.										
14	Q. Okay. Well, how is the fact that some										
15	new investment is coming into the industry consistent										
16	with your testimony that there's a chronic oversupply?										
17	A. That's a good question.										
18	Q. And I'm anticipating you have a good										
19	answer.										
20	A. You know, people have different										
21	situations and different contracts. In general, I think										
22	there's a consensus in the industry that the aroma										
23	situation has been fairly [inaudible] and balance. And										
24	you know, it could be a grower that has a high										
25	percentage of those contracts. I think each individual										

1	situation is different.
2	Q. All right. But isn't the fact that you
3	have some producers who are expanding production and
4	increasing investment evidence of the fact that there is
5	not a chronic oversupply; indeed there's demand for more
6	hops?
7	A. I think testimony later on will probably
8	clear that question up for you and I defer that to the
9	folks that will be testifying after me. I think they
10	can speak to your question and I think they're more
11	qualified to answer it than I am.
12	Q. Okay. Who in particular are you thinking
13	about?
14	A. I think our economic justifications will
15	core that question.
16	Q. That's Mr. Smith?
17	A. Mr. Smith and Mr. Folwell next week.
18	Q. All right. Now, you looked at these
19	scenarios of what a declining producer versus an
20	expanding producer would need to do as far as their sale
21	and purchase of base. Is that correct?
22	A. Yeah. The committee certainly has
23	listened to the grower community through the input
24	process and we've heard what we think is a consensus
25	from the industry on how to proceed. Yeah.

1	Q. And isn't it true that an expanding												
2	producer would be required in the first year to buy base												
3	to cover his production?												
4	A. Depending on the saleable and depending												
5	on decisions that the administrative committee will												
6	make, certainly that's a potential.												
7	Q. And he would be buying base from a												
8	producer who had reduced his production. Is that												
9	correct?												
10	A. Potentially.												
11	Q. And how is that consistent with your												
12	principle #2 that the costs be equitably distributed?												
13	A. We have designed the order so that there												
14	should be plenty of base available on the front end. We												
15	heard from growers in certain segments of the industry												
16	that felt that '97 year was important to them. We had												
17	other growers who felt the later years was important to												
18	them to have that option. What we tried to do is to												
19	take a big tent approach and tried to please as many												
20	people as possible, recognizing we could not please												
21	everybody in terms of establishing what the base period												
22	would be.												
23	Q. Well, is oh, I'm sorry.												
24	A. In fact, subsequent to submitting our												
25	proposal, we added the 2002 year to that as well. We do												
	York Stenographic Services, Inc.												

1	not want base to have a value to speak of on the front
2	end and that is one of the reasons why we went to the
3	now six-year period so that there would be plenty of
4	base available for those growers that needed it at
5	hopefully a very low value.
6	Q. Now, you said you don't want base to have
7	a value at the front end. By front end, do you mean the
8	first year of operation of the marketing order?
9	A. I don't think we want to have
10	certainly we don't want to have base to have a value at
11	any point, but we also recognize that if the order is
12	working the way we hope it to that you know there will
13	be some value to having an order and therefore some
14	value to the base.
15	Q. Well, isn't it true that under the old
16	order that base got as high as \$.90 a pound?
17	A. I'm not sure. I don't recall enough
18	about the old order to know what the values were.
19	Q. Is there a limit on the value of base \neg -
20	I mean dollars per pound limit on the value of base?
21	A. Not that I know of. To the extent there
22	might be a limit to the value of hops, I guess there
23	would be, but I don't know.
24	Q. All right. So but isn't it your
25	anticipation under the first few years of operation of

1	the marketing order that an expanding producer would											
2	need to buy base to cover his production from a											
3	declining producer who no longer was producing those											
4	hops.											
5	A. That potential exists.											
6	Q. All right. And wouldn't that just											
7	constitute a wealth transfer between the expanding and											
8	declining producer?											
9	A. No. Not in my opinion.											
10	Q. And why is that?											
11	A. I just don't think it fits the definition											
12	of wealth transfer.											
13	Q. Well, if I'm an expanding producer and I											
14	write a check to you, a declining producer, aren't I											
15	giving some of my wealth to you?											
16	A. Well, I think you're making a business											
17	deal.											
18	Q. All right. The bona fide effort											
19	requirement, is it your understanding that in order to											
20	keep your base that a producer would need to produce											
21	hops in a given season in order to retain his base?											
22	A. You know, I'm going to defer that to											
23	other members of the committee that have been assigned											
24	those specific parts of the proposal to defend.											
25	Q. All right. Why should - if I'm an											
	York Stenographic Services, Inc.											

expand:	ing	produc	cer,	why	should	lI	have	to	write	a che	ck
to you,	, a	decli	ning	prod	lucer,	whe	re as	s I	could	just,	on
the ot	her	hand,	get	base	from	the	com	nitt	tee poo	01?	

A. I don't know.

- Q. Well, what would be the objection to just having a system where base was not -- base not being produced was just turned into the committee and the committee kept a list of that available pounds and if I just wanted to be a new producer I could just get it for free from the committee?
- A. Well, I think what the committee has tried to do is listen to all segments of the industry and put together a proposal that is amenable to a majority of the industry. And there have been attempts to get proposals from people who in general agree that we need a marketing order to bring stability to our industry but have a problem with the specific initial base allotment period. And again, what we tried to do was listen to all segments of the industry and put together a proposal that would work for as many in the industry as possible.
- Q. Well, would you have any objection to modification of proposal under which you would just get your base from the committee rather than having to pay another grower for it?

1	A. For initial base allotment?
2	Q. No. Your yeah. That's correct.
3	A. You know I would have to defer to that to
4	the committee. That proposal was never brought before
5	us at any point during the input process. And I would
6	have to defer that to the committee to decide.
7	Certainly we've been open to any type of modification
8	that makes it more palatable to anybody.
9	Q. All right. Would you have any objection
01	to that?
11	A. Personally?
12	Q. Yes.
13	A. I can't speak on behalf of the committee
14	in that regard.
15	Q. No. Just yourself personally, would you
16	object to a system of obtaining base from the committee
17	rather than to paying growers for it?
18	A. I would have to give that more thought
19	than I'm able to right at this point to answer your
20	question.
21	Q. Okay. Regarding those seven grower
22	entities I asked you about before, did any of those
23	growers obtain any kind of an economic interest in hops
24	grown on your farm?
25	A. Not to my knowledge.
	York Stenographic Services, Inc.

-	v. All light. four Honor, if I could just					
2	have a moment to confer with my colleagues?					
3	***					
4	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: You may. Let's					
5	go off record. It's now 11:49.					
6	* * *					
7	[Off the record.]					
8	[On the record.]					
9	***					
10	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: We're back on at					
11	11:49. Mr. Moody, if you'd repeat what you said off					
12	record?					
13	MR. MOODY: Nothing further for me, Your					
14	Honor. And thank you, Mr. Carpenter.					
15	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Thank you, Mr.					
16	Moody. Now, there may be other cross-examination of					
17	this witness, but I just want to give you an idea of how					
18	I'm keeping time. Those against the proposals have so					
19	far consumed 50 minutes. That's 50 in the cross-					
20	examination. The Proponents have consumed 31 minutes.					
21	So this gives you an idea of how I'm keeping track of					
22	time. When the Proponents are using the time they're					
23	being clocked for it. So far they've used less than					
24	those who are against the proposals. Just so you all					
25	know that your cross-examination counts as well as your					
	York Stenographic Services, Inc.					
	34 North George St., York, PA 17401 - (717) 854-0077					

1	direct examination of witnesses. All right. Additional
2	cross-examination or do you want to take a brief break.
3	How is everybody's comfort level? Any suggestions? Mr.
4	Monahan?
5	MR. MONAHAN: I just suggest that we power
6	through with this witness until the break, Your Honor.
7	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: All right. Is
8	that suitable with everyone? All right. Mr. Carswell.
9	MR. CARSWELL: Yes, ma'am. I guess our
10	southerners are going to be penalized for speaking
11	slowly.
12	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: No. No. It's
13	just going to take more of your minutes.
14	MR. CARSWELL: That's what I mean.
15	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Makes a better
16	record.
17	***
18	CROSS-EXAMINATION
19	BY MR. CARSWELL:
20	Q. I better speed up. I just want to walk
21	you through a hypo, Mr. Carpenter, and I will try to
22	make this brief. But forgive me if I make a mistake.
23	I'll try to correct myself. But under the proposal it's
24	my understanding that a grower will be assigned a base
25	based on he can take the highest yield of the last
	York Stenographic Services, Inc.
	34 North George St., York, PA 17401 - (717) 854-0077

1	five years between '97 and 2002 it may change to 2003					
2	or it may be have you changed it to 2003?					
3	A. We added the 2002 year. Originally it					
4	was your one year between '97 and 2001, and the reason					
5	for that is you got to recognize this was a two-year					
6	process. A 2002 year had no existed yet and we didn't					
7	want to incent growers to plant hops					
8	Q. Ramp up					
9	Ain anticipation. Correct.					
10	Q. Okay.					
11	A. So the 2002 year has been added as an					
12	option for a base initial base allocation year.					
13	Q. So assume we're working '97 to 2002 and					
14	the grower would take logically it would be in their					
15	economic interest to take their highest yield. Correct?					
16	A. That would be logical. Correct.					
17	Q. To establish the base.					
18	A. Yes.					
19	Q. So assume we have grower A who has grown					
20	100,000 pounds of hop with an alpha content of ten					
21	percent. So we have 10,000 pounds would be his base.					
22	And assume that he did that in 1997 and assume that he's					
23	declined the production from 100,000 pounds down to					
24	10,000 pounds. So grower A now is, in the last crop					
25	year, is growing 10,000 pounds and with 1000 pounds of					
	York Stenographic Services, Inc.					

1	alpha production. Now assume grower B. And grower B,
2	in 1997, began at 10,000 pounds. And because of being
3	very efficient, being very competitive, getting
4	contracts he's grown, in this last crop year in 2002,
5	100,000 pounds of a hop and in both '97 and 2002 the
6	alpha content is again 10 percent and so he's up to
7	100,000. Now, grower A will receive a 10,000 pound
8	alpha, 100,000 hop base allotment under the terms of the
9	HMO, correct, the proposed I'll call it HMO, Hop
10	Marketing Order?
11	A. Sure.
12	Q. And so will grower B. Now assume for the
13	sake of the hypothetical that the hop administrative
14	committee establishes a 50 percent cut in the saleable
15	quantity, which as we'll some of our experts will
16	later discuss maybe or likely will be what's necessary
17	to achieve a significant reduction in the amount of hops
18	available in the market. So just for the sake of this
19	hypo, though, assume that we have a 50 percent cut in
20	the saleable quality. So now we have grower A who can
21	grow 50,000 pounds of hops and with a 5000 pounds of
22	alpha. Is that correct?
23	A. If I understand, yes.
24	Q. And grower B will also be able to grow
25	50,000 pounds of hops with a 5000 pounds of alpha. Is

1	that correct? They'll be able to grow as much as they
2	want, but that's how much they'll be able to sell. Is
3	that correct?
4	A. Depending on the alpha factor that is
5	correct of the particular variety. Yeah.
6	Q. I'm a little out of line here in terms of
7	the logical process, but go back to grower A. The
8	reason why he's declined from 100,000 pounds to 10,000
9	pounds is that he couldn't find a market for his
10	products. He wasn't competitive. Okay. Okay. So now
11	we have a situation grower A, who grew 10,000 pounds in
12	the latest year because he wasn't competitive now can
13	either grow he can grow the same 10,000 pounds and
14	he'll have a 40,000 pound base allotment or sell.
15	Grower B, who grew 100,000 pounds last year can only now
16	sell 50,000 pounds unless he purchases base allotment
17	and he grew 100,000 pounds the last year because he was
18	competitive and grower A grew 10,000 pounds last year
19	because he was not competitive. How is that equitable
20	and fair that grower B would have to purchase from a
21	grower, and it could be grower A, an allotment so that
22	he could expand or not expand but just grow what
23	he grew last year?
24	A. Well, there's a lot of hypotheticals in
25	there and it's certainly something this whole issue York Stenographic Services, Inc.
	TOTA STERIOZIADINE SELVICES, INC.

1	is something that the committee spent a lot of time on.
2	It's really the guts of the order, trying to come up
3	with something that is fair and equitable to as many
4	growers as possible. Certainly in that extreme example
5	that you've given, it appears to be inequitable that the
6	grower who has expanded and has been competitive and et
7	cetera, et cetera, would have to purchase base.
8	However, another feature that we've designed into this
9	would be the fact that there's going to be so much base
10	available on the front end of this thing it's the
11	committee's hope that an equilibrium will be found early
12	on in the order especially with a strong bona fide
13	effort requirement. In other words, if you've got that
14	base, you've either got to use it or you've got to it
15	you don't use it you lose it. So it's our hope that
16	over the next couple of years that an equilibrium will
17	be found minimizing any economic impact on growers who
18	are going to need base.
19	Q. You mentioned that there would be a lot
20	of base available, but if you had a 50 percent cut in
21	saleable quantity, isn't it also true that there will be
22	a lot of base needed for either growers who have been
23	steady in their production or expanding?
24	A. That's a concern. In fact, it's a
25	concern of mine as somebody that probably will need to
	York Stenographic Services, Inc.

obtain base at least in the hear future. But again,
this proposal is based on input from people throughout
the industry and this is where we felt a consensus
needed to be. Our friends in Oregon, you know, told us
that '97 year was important to them. In general, if you
look at the production in Oregon over the past few years
it's been in decline. And Washington, with the
exception of 2002, it's been the opposite. And so in
trying to forge together a proposal that meets the needs
of as many growers as possible, this is the system we've
come up with. Certainly if there is a system that could
be put in place that would meet the needs of more
growers, we have been, all the way through this process,
open to listening to suggestions. And this seemed to be
the suggestion that worked for most growers.
Q. Now assume, just again for the purposes

Q. Now assume, just again for the purposes of this hypothetical, that grower B has to buy -- to grow what he grew last year he has to acquire 50,000 pounds of base allotment and it costs \$1 a pound -- assume a price of \$1 a pound to acquire that. And so he's spending 50,000 extra dollars at \$1 per pound, which is pretty -- that would be a pretty high amount as compared to what he can even sell his hops for.

A. It would be an extremely high amount.

And in practicability, I just can't see how the base is

York Stenographic Services, Inc.

going to have that type of value on the front end of
this thing. Again, by design we try to develop a
proposal that would have plenty of base available on the
front of it with the expectation that that would find an
equilibrium level and minimize the economic impact on
any individual farm.

- Q. Do you think there will be any market value to the base? Do you think the base would be free?
- A. I think it will be very inexpensive on the front end. I just there's going to be so much of it out there. One of the challenges we've had with building this proposal is the fact that, you know, two years have taken place since we really started looking in earnest into this as a potential to take ownership in this problem we have as an industry and do something to solve it. And it's probably the main reason that that 2002 year was added because time does go on and the sizes of farms fluctuate. And again, the goal of this thing is just to put together something that's as equitable to as many people as possible. This seemed to be the program that was favored by most of the people going through the input process.
- Q. Would you characterize most growers as having declining production or most growers just having expanding production or most is steady or can you

 York Stenographic Services, Inc.

Categorize it any may the industry.	categorize	it	any	way,	the	industry?
-------------------------------------	------------	----	-----	------	-----	-----------

- A. It would -- perhaps there are some of my fellow members of the Proponents Committee that would have -- be able to answer that better in general. The industry has been declining and I think that you could say that the average grower probably has. Certainly we have on our operation over the past 15 years.
 - Q. So then separate question. Who would you see as -- can you categorize a group as expanding producers or steady visa vie declining producers? And I think you've indicated, you know, most growers are declining. And who would you see as benefiting most from the Hop Marketing Order? Declining producers or expanding/steady producers?
 - A. Well, as a member of the Proponents

 Committee who's listened to input over the last couple of years, I would hope that all growers would benefit from the marketing order. Again, certainly there's going to be some equilibrium that takes place in terms of the base allocation on the front end. But we've designed this thing to minimize the economic impact of base transfers that may take place over the first few years of the order.
 - Q. I'm sorry. But let me ask you my question again. Who would you -- can you give an York Stenographic Services, Inc.

 34 North George St., York, PA 17401 (717) 854-0077

1	opinion as to who would benefit, declining producers or		
2	steady/expanding producers, under the basic structure of		
3	the proposed order?		
4	***		
5	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: He did answer it		
6	when he said he thought all producers would benefit.		
7	But go ahead and go back		
8	MR. CARSWELL: Okay.		
9	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE:to ask more		
10	specifics.		
11	***		
12	BY MR. CARSWELL:		
13	Q. Thank you. Thank you. You don't see		
14	steady and expanding producers having to pay net to		
15	declining producers to be able to maintain their		
16	production.		
17	A. I think there will be a transfer that		
18	takes place. I'm not willing to speculate on what the		
19	financial terms of that transactions are going to be.		
20	Q. And as far as the category of steady and		
21	expanding producers versus declining producers, do you		
22	think that that's fair and equitable to steady and		
23	expanding producers?		
24	A. As a steady and expanding producer, yes,		
25	I do think it's equitable.		
	York Stenographic Services, Inc.		
	34 North George St., York, PA 17401 - (717) 854-0077		

1	Q. And you would define yourself as a	
2	steady/expanding producer over the last five years.	
3	A. That's correct.	
4	Q. I think that's all I have. Thank you,	
5	Your Honor.	
6	***	
7	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Thank you, Mr.	
8	Carswell. Mr. Jekanowski.	
9	***	
10	BY MR. JEKANOWSKI:	
11	Q. Thank you, Your Honor. Mr. Carpenter,	
12	how do you decide what to produce on your farm?	
13	A. By looking at how I can make the most	
14	money.	
15	Q. Okay. Do you produce other things other	
16	than hops other crops?	
17	A. On our ranch?	
18	Q. Yeah.	
19	A. Yes. That's correct.	
20	Q. What other crops do you produce?	
21	A. Apples, cherries, wine grapes, pears, a	
22	few apricots.	
23	Q. When would you say that the oversupply	
24	situation that's led to this marketing order proposal	
25	when would you say that it kind of came about? When has	
	York Stenographic Services, Inc.	
	34 North George St., York, PA 17401 - (717) 854-0077	

1	it developed?
2	A. You know I think we've got some numbers
3	later on from other members of the committee that can
4	specifically show you, based on industry numbers, when
5	that occurred, but over the last few years.
6	Q. Now, over the last few years. You've
7	stated before that your production is increasing has
8	increased over the last few years or at least stayed
9	steady.
10	A. Steady or slightly increasing. Right.
11	Q. Why would you increase production if
12	there's an oversupply situation?
13	A. I think there has been lack of an
14	oversupply situation to this point on aroma hops. I
15	think things have been fairly much in balance and we
16	have planted in recent year some aroma hops. Our alpha
7	production has been declining on our ranch.
8	Q. So you've mentioned so you don't think
9	that you're overproducing. So you're not really part of
20	the industry problem of overproduction.
21	A. Oh, I think we need to all assume a
22	little bit of the responsibility there.
23	Q. Okay. Well, if you're willing to accept
24	some of the responsibility, then why haven't you
2.5	decreased production over the last few years? Why
	York Stenographic Services, Inc.

1	haven't you done it on your own?
2	A. Well, we've had markets for the hops that
3	we've produced. And again, the expansion that we've had
4	on our ranch has been mainly in the aroma area.
5	Q. Okay.
6	A. And there seems to have been a market for
7	that.
8	Q. Why is it that you feel that a committee
9	eight-member committee or what it is why is that a
10	committee can determine the needs of the market better
11	than your own decision making?
12	A. I think I can make as an individual, I
13	can make the best decision in the world in terms of
14	marketing and what to grow and still have those
15	decisions wrong if we don't have some type of a system
16	in place for the entire industry. And I think you'll
17	hear testimony later on from people more versed in the
18	subject than I am that the last marketing order did
19	bring a degree of stability to our industry.
20	Q. You've mentioned that you grow other
21	crops including apples. What's the market been like for
22	apples over the last few years?
23	A. Similar to the hop market in that certain
24	varieties have done well and others have not. And our
25	acreage in apples have reflected the same thing.

1	Q. If it's a similar situation, then would			
2	you say that a marketing order would work for apples too			
3	I mean the same type or program?			
4	A. I think in general you could argue it			
5	might. You got it's a literally an apples to			
6	oranges comparison because you have so many different			
7	varieties of apples and apples can be grown in a lot			
8	more locations than hops.			
9	Q. So it would be harder to regulate apples			
10	because they might be grown in other areas of the			
11	country.			
12	A. I think that's one factor that would make			
13	it a little bit tougher.			
14	Q. Hops can be grown in other countries. Is			
15	that right?			
16	A. Yes. They can.			
17	Q. So by the same logic, what do you think			
18	might happen if the U.S. industry restricts its supply			
19	without having an ability to regulate other producers in			
20	other nations?			
21	A. Well, if we have people on our			
22	administrative committee that are making decisions to			
23	restrict supply to the detriment of our market share, I			
24	can tell you they aren't going to be earning my vote for			
25	very long.			

1	Q. I don't want to go back to the whole line
2	of questioning that Mr. Moody brought up before, but
3	just really quickly, so basically you're saying that
4	there's going to be someone in this committee who is
5	able to balance supply and demand and still grow or
6	maintain exports and bring the industry into balance.
7	A. Someone on the committee?
8	Q. Or some committee or some smart people on
9	this committee who are going to be able to accomplish
10	this.
11	A. I hope so.
12	Q. I just want to return again to USDA, the
13	Exhibit 5. I think it was Table 7. When Dr. Hinman was
14	testifying, I pointed out the fact that this balancing
15	item is a very large proportion of production and supply
16	and demand and that basically that represents an error.
17	So your what I hear you saying is that there is a
18	committee that's going to be formed that's going to do a
19	better job at estimating supply and demand than the USDA
20	was able to do up through 1996.
21	A. I can't say whether they'll be able to do
22	a better job. I would hope that they would be able to
23	function similarly to the administrative committee
24	functioning in the prior order. That committee was able
25	to make decisions that brought a certain amount of

r	stability to our industry and I would hope that we would			
2	be able to repeat that with this order.			
3	Q. So its your opinion that the order the			
4	previous order worked well and achieved its goals.			
5	A. I think it worked well in terms of			
6	bringing long-term stability to the industry.			
7	Q. That being said, in your opinion, why was			
8	the previous order terminated?			
9	A. A combination of quite a few things. I			
10	think the political atmosphere in DC at the time had an			
11	anti-regulatory tone. I think that was a factor. I			
12	think we had perhaps the committee handle some			
13	situations that should have been handled a little bit			
14	differently. You know I think there are just a whole			
15	lot of factors that went into that and there was, quite			
16	frankly, I think, some provisions that really didn't			
17	serve the needs of the industry real well, that we have			
18	tried to address and to change in our proposal.			
19	Q. I have nothing further.			
20	* * *			
21	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: All right.			
22	Thank you, Mr. Jekanowski. Any additional cross-			
23	examination?			
24	MR. CARSWELL: I'm sorry. I just wanted to			
25	follow up on one area.			
	York Stenographic Services, Inc.			
	9 4 5 7 .1 <i>(</i>)			

	1	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Mr. Carswell.
	2	***
	3	BY MR. CARSWELL:
	4	Q. I'm sorry, Mr. Carpenter. You had
	5	characterized yourself earlier as a steady or expanding
	6	producer.
	7	A. Over the past five years.
	8	Q. Over the past five years.
	9	A. Right.
	10	Q. But then I think I heard you say maybe
	11	your alpha has been reduced in the last
	12	A. I think our alpha acreage has been
•	13	reduced. Again, I didn't realize I was going on trial
	14	down here. I would have brought information from my own
	15	individual operation. But in general, on our ranch, our
	16	alpha producing acre has slightly declined over the past
	17	five years. I think that's a fair statement to say.
	18	Q. So I'm sorry. Net you're producing less
	19	alpha now than you were five years ago. Is that
	20	accurate?
	21	A. I believe so.
	22	Q. Okay. So you wouldn't be characterized
	23	as a steady or expanding producer.
	24	A. In terms of
	25	Q. In terms of
		York Stenographic Services, Inc.
		34 North George St., York, PA 17401 - (717) 854-0077

1	Apounds of hops we have and acres of		
2	hops in terms of pounds of hops we are producing more		
3	pounds than we did five years ago.		
4	Q. In terms of characterization under the		
5	proposed HMO and how the HMO would work, based on alpha,		
6	though, you would not be. Is that correct?		
7	A. I have not this is going to be hard to		
8	believe, but I have not really gone back and looked at		
9	what our base position would be under the proposed order		
10	to really be able to answer that question accurately.		
11	Q. Okay. I don't want to mischaracterize		
12	you, but earlier you said that you felt like this was		
13	fair and equitable to steady or expanding producers as a		
14	steady or expanding producers.		
15	A. Correct.		
16	Q. I guess you're indicating now that you		
17	don't know whether you are a steady or expanding		
18	producer under the effect of the HMO. Is that		
19	A. We are producing more pounds of hops		
20	Q. Right. But alpha content based on		
21	alpha content.		
22	A. I don't know. You know I can't answer		
23	that. I thought you meant in terms of pounds of hops		
24	and		
25	Q. But in terms of		
	York Stenographic Services, Inc.		
	34 North George St., York, PA 17401 - (717) 854-0077		

i	A. I don't know.
2	Q. You don't know.
3	A. I would think it would probably be steady
4	but
5	Q. Maybe not.
6	Apossibly not.
7	Q. Okay. That's all. Thank you.
8	***
9	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Thank you, Mr.
10	Carswell. Mr. Moody?
11	***
12	BY MR. MOODY:
13	Q. Thank you. Mr. Carpenter, just a couple
14	of questions. Introducing the members of the Proponent
15	Committee it seemed as though everybody was from
16	Washington State. Do you have any Proponent Committee
17	members from either Oregon or Idaho?
18	A. We don't have any committee members from
19	either of those states.
20	Q. Any particular reason for that?
21	A. I think part of it you know we had
22	some people that participated on the production
23	management team level and they were given the
24	opportunity. But we heard specifically from Oregon
25	that, you know, we should to be more blunt, we're
	York Stenographic Services, Inc.
	34 North George St., York, PA 17401 - (717) 854-0077

```
1
       part of the problem and we should take leadership role
       in providing some solutions. And so we've taken that
2
3
       challenge and tried to put together a proposal.
       Certainly we've made several trips to Oregon and Idaho
4
5
       to gather input and to run by first drafts and have
       solicited input from both areas.
6
7
                  Q.
                       Would you have any objection to...
8
                  ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE:
9
                                                  Mr. Moody, I
10
       need to change the tape. Just a moment please.
                                  Okay.
11
                  MR. MOODY:
                                    * * *
12
        [Off the record.]
13
14
        [On the record.]
15
                                                 We're back on
16
                  ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE:
        record now at 12:19. Mr. Moody.
17
18
                  MR. MOODY:
                                  Thank you, Your Honor.
                  ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE:
19
                                                 You were asking
        if he would have any objection...
20
21
                  BY MR. MOODY:
22
                        Right. Would you have any objection, Mr.
23
        Carpenter, to including -- since the season will be over
24
        by then -- '03 season production in calculation of base?
25
                          York Stenographic Services, Inc.
```

i	A. Again, I can't I don't want to speak		
2	on behalf of the committee. I think certainly if you're		
3	proposing that there would be support, additional		
4	support if the 2003 were added, I think that's something		
5	that the committee would consider. But I can't answer		
6	that on behalf of the committee. In terms of my		
7	personal opinion, I'd have to give that a little more		
8	thought before I answered your question.		
9	Q. All right. And then for purposes of who		
10	gets to vote in the referendum, should it be the grower		
11	for the '03 season?		
12	A. Well, I think we'll have some specific		
13	proposals later on that another one of our team leaders		
14	will be putting together for the USDA's consideration.		
15	And I don't have anything specific that I can I can't		
16	specifically answer that right now.		
17	Q. Okay. In addition to your own farm, do		
18	you have an economic interest in Yakima Chief Ranches,		
19	LLC?		
20	A. I do not personally. No.		
21	Q. Does your family?		
22	A. Yes.		
23	Q. And do you know if they're a declining or		
24	an expanding producer?		
25	A. Carpenter Farms or Yakima Chief Ranches?		
	York Stenographic Services, Inc.		

1	Q.	Yakima Chief Ranches.	
2	A.	That would be definitely a declining	
3	producer.		
4	Q.	Okay. And do you know why it is they are	
5	a declining pro	oducer whereas your own operation, you've	
6	sort of indicat	ted, is fairly stable?	
7	Α.	Well, again, we're getting a little bit	
8	into proprieta:	ry information, but I can say that the	
9	ownership of Ya	akima Chief Ranches, to my knowledge, has	
10	decided to transition out of hop production in general.		
11	Q.	And has the acreage they've taken out of	
12	hop production	gone into producing other commodities?	
13	Α.	Part of it has.	
14	Q.	And has some of the acreage been sold?	
15	Α.	Part of it has.	
16	Q.	And the production in other commodities	
17	is more profitable than the hops production.		
18	Α.	I don't know. I'm not ready to say that.	
19	Q.	And isn't it true that over the last 10	
20	years or so that the acreage in hops has been gradually		
21	reducing?		
22	Α.	I think that's a fair assessment. Yeah.	
23	Q.	And is that an indication, in your view,	
24	that the marke	t forces is inherent and the free market	
25	are responding	to the changing demand characteristics?	
		York Stenographic Services, Inc.	

1	A. I think that's a fair assessment.
2	Q. All right. So the free market forces are
3	acting in such a way as to bring the current supply in
4	line with demand.
5	A. I would certainly hope so.
6	Q. Okay. That's it. Thank you, Mr.
7	Carpenter.
8	***
9	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Any additional
10	cross-examination of this witness? Ms. Deskins.
11	***
12	BY MS. DESKINS:
13	Q. Mr. Carpenter, I had a couple questions
14	for you. One, you have a farm. Can you tell us where
15	your farm is located and a general size for it?
16	A. Yeah. Our farm is located almost in the
17	middle of the Yakima Valley in Washington State in the
18	Dranger, Sunnyside area. And I believe we're farming
19	I don't want to get into specific acreages by crop, but
20	I think we're farming 1100 acres, something like that.
21	Q. Okay. And how long have you been in the
22	farming industry?
23	A. Well, I'm the 5th generation in the
24	Yakima Valley and I believe my family farmed before that
25	as well so we've been here since in the Yakima Valley
	York Stenographic Services, Inc.
	34 North George St., York, PA 17401 - (717) 854-0077

1	since the late 1870's.
2	Q. Okay. And also you were asked some
3	questions about the Proponent Committee. And I'm just
4	trying to clarify this. When you said when you were
5	responding to questions about the committee, were you
6	saying the people who were on the committee were people
7	who were part of the group? I'm trying to understand
8	how it's set up.
9	A. The Proponents Committee?
10	Q. Right. Is there a committee and the
11	people are just members of the committee but they
12	represent another group of people. Is that how it
13	works?
14	A. No. I think it's fair to say that
15	Proponents Committee represents a pretty good cross-
16	section in terms of grower size. We've got some large
17	growers involved. We've got some small growers
18	involved. But in terms of representing formally
19	different segments of the industry, I don't think that's
20	the case.
21	Q. Okay. That's all the questions I had.
22	Thank you.
23	***
24	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: All right. Yes.
25	***

I	BI MS. FINN:
2	Q. Mr. Carpenter, you mentioned the Hop
3	Growers of America. What is their primary purpose?
4	A. The Hop Growers of America is our
5	national organization. It's the executive committee
6	is made up of growers from all three growing regions.
7	And they don't deal, necessarily, with, you know,
8	research and that type of thing. That's our
9	respective state commissions deal with that. But it's
10	just kind of a national organization. They organized
11	the annual convention. They are doing some work on
12	promoting American hops around the world and just
13	general industry governance issues.
14	Q. Okay. And how are they funded?
15	A. Boy. I'd almost like to defer that to
16	some other members who are on that Board, but I believe
17	it comes from a percentage of the assessments. I should
18	is that where it comes from.
19	Q. I was just wondering is it like a
20	voluntary program.
21	A. I think it's funded mandatorily from the
22	different commissions.
23	Q. And it does include all of Idaho and
24	Oregon, Washington and California?
25	A. That's correct to my knowledge.
	York Stenographic Services, Inc.
	34 North George St., York, PA 17401 - (717) 854-0077

1	Q. Are there other trade associations that
2	deal with hops?
3	A. Not to my knowledge.
4	Q. Okay. That's all I have.
5	***
6	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Thank you, Ms.
7	Finn. By the way, when the Government participants in
8	the hearing ask questions they are neither opponents and
9	proponents and their time is not counted. Any other
10	cross-examination? Yes, Dr. Hinman?
11	***
12	BY DR. HINMAN:
13	Q. To follow up on the Hops Growers of
14	America, the government submitted some data based
15	entirely on government sources. Is it true that the
16	Hops Growers of America publishes an annual statistical
17	compendium that incorporate a great deal of data from
18	the same sources plus a great deal of industry data?
19	A. Yeah. That's true.
20	Q. Does for the completeness of the
21	economic record of this hearing, is the Proponent
22	Committee considering putting into evidence a number of,
23	you know the current and say a number of past issues
24	to help understand, you know, the economic situation of
25	the industry?
	York Stenographic Services, Inc.

1	A. Yes. I think that is our that's one
2	of our goals.
3	Q. Okay. Thank you.
4	***
5	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Thank you, Dr.
6	Hinman. Any other cross-examination? There being none,
7	Mr. Monahan, do you have any additional questions?
8	MR. MONAHAN: Yes. Does Your Honor know a
9	good place for lunch?
10	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: I think I'll be
11	eating right here hopefully. All right. How long would
12	you like to take for lunch, Mr. Monahan?
13	MR. MONAHAN: I'd defer to others present.
14	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: All right. Any
15	suggestions? Would an hour be sufficient? 90 minutes?
16	No. Too much? Hour and 15 minutes.
17	MS. DESKINS: How about an hour and 15 and
18	that way people having any copying to do this would be a
19	good opportunity to do that?
20	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Please be back
21	and ready to go at 1:45. Thank you.
22	* * *
23	[Off the record.]
24	[On the record.]
25	***

1	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: We're back on
2	record at 1:49 p.m. I'd like just to clarify whether
3	any copies of the document that was to be photocopied
4	have been distributed at this point. Mr. Monahan?
5	MR. MONAHAN: Hasn't happened, Your Honor.
6	We're gathering our forces this afternoon and we will
7	have comprehensive copies of all of the statements
8	available for the court reporter and other parties at
9	the conclusion of today's hearing before tomorrow.
10	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: All right. And
11	the document that is Exhibit let's see
12	MR. MONAHAN: 15.
13	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE:15 yes
14	do you have any copies of that yet?
15	MR. MONAHAN: I'm afraid I don't, Your Honor.
16	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Okay. And do
17	you want to move the admission of Mr. Carpenter's
18	statement at this time or do you want to wait until a
19	later time.
20	MR. MONAHAN: I'm happy to move for it now.
21	I was anticipating I guess I should say I did not
22	anticipate that he would be on the stand that long and I
23	was anticipating moving for the admission of 7 through
24	14 at the conclusion of the Proponents testimony. But
25	it probably makes more sense to move for it now, Your
	York Stenographic Services, Inc.
	34 North George St., York, PA 17401 - (717) 854-0077

1	Honor. So consider it moved.
2	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: All right. Is
3	there any objection to the admission into evidence of
4	Exhibit 7, which is Mr. Carpenter's statement? There
5	being none, Exhibit 7 is hereby admitted into evidence.
6	All right. I'm aware that Mr. Carpenter remains
7	available for recall and that at this time the
8	Proponents are yielding so that Mr. Moody, is this
9	your witness?
10	MR. MOODY: No, Your Honor. He mentioned
11	he needed to testify today because of his plane
12	connections.
13	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: All right. Very
14	good. Would you identify yourself please?
15	MR. DECELLE: Yes, Your Honor. Thank you.
16	My name is Arthur, A-r-t-h-u-r, DeCelle, D-e-C-e-l-l-e.
17	I am the executive vice president and general counsel of
18	the Beer Institute, which is a trade association
19	representing domestic and multi-national brewers as well
20	as suppliers of agricultural and other materials to the
21	brewing industry. Our members product approximately 90
22	percent of the beer
23	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Just a moment.
24	Now that you've identified yourself I'll swear you in.
25	MR. DECELLE: Oh, I apologize.
	York Stenographic Services, Inc.

1	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: No. That's
2	fine. You have a statement that you'll be reading into
3	the record. Is that correct?
4	MR. DECELLE: Yes, Your Honor.
5	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: And would you
6	also like that marked as an exhibit so that it can be
7	taken into evidence that way as well or will it be
8	sufficient that the transcript contains your testimony?
9	MR. DECELLE: No. I think the transcript
10	will be adequate.
11	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: All right. Very
12	fine. Do you consider yourself either in favor of the
13	proposals or against the proposals that are being
14	considered here?
15	MR. DECELLE: We are against the proposal,
16	Your Honor.
17	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: All right.
18	Thank you.
19	***
20	[Witness sworn]
21	***
22	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Thank you. You
23	may proceed.
24	MR. DECELLE: Okay. Thank you. As I've
25	already outlined the purpose of the beer industry trade
	York Stenographic Services, Inc.

```
association, the Beer Institute, which I represent.
 1
        Beer is one of the few consumer products still primarily
 2
        made in the United States. 90 percent of the beer sold
 3
        in the United States is produced here, something that's
        very unusual for most consumer product categories these
 5
               Beer is also a mature product category. Over the
 6
        last 30 years, our industry has been very stable with
 7
        per capita consumption remaining about the same and
8
        increases or declines in total volume under two percent
9
        in any given year over the entire period from the 1970's
10
        to the present. There was one exception in 1990 where
11
        volume increased in anticipation of a major excise tax
12
13
        increase. And I have two charts that I would like to
        enter into the record as exhibits at this point in time.
14
15
                  ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE:
                                                 You've handed me
        a chart that's entitled Beer Capita -- excuse me -- "Per
16
        Capita Beer Consumption." And I'm going to need one
17
        copy to be the official record copy. And have you
18
19
        distributed any of these other copies at this point?
20
                  MR. DECELLE:
                                  No. We have not.
21
                  ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE:
                                                 All right.
        Mr. Monahan, would you come forward and take one and
22
        Mr. Moody -- would you deliver that to Mr. Moody and
23
        Mr. Monahan, would you deliver that to Ms. Deskins?
24
25
                  MR. MOODY:
                                  Your Honor, could we make those
                          York Stenographic Services, Inc.
                  34 North George St., York, PA 17401 - (717) 854-0077
```

1	16 and 17? Is that the next two numbers in line?
2	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Yes. Let's mark
3	this one well, no well, I do have one this is
4	the record copy though.
5	MR. DECELLE: I have additional if you
6	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: How many more do
7	you have?
8	MR. DECELLE: Two or three.
9	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Oh, good. I
10	would like both economists to have these. I'd like you
11	to make a couple of trips. Would you first just deliver
12	the "Per Capita Beer Consumption" to the two economists.
13	All right. And now of the other let's see the
14	"Per Capita Beer Consumption Exhibit will be Exhibit 16.
15	And your other chart?
16	MR. DECELLE: The other chart is entitled
17	"U.S. Domestic Brewer Output."
18	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: All right.
19	We'll make that Exhibit 17. And did you also have some
20	additional ones of that so that each of the economists
21	could have one of those?
22	MR. DECELLE: Yes, Your Honor.
23	O ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: All right.
24	Good. All right. We'll go off record while those are
25	distributed.

1	* * *
2	[Off the record.]
3	[On the record.]
4	***
5	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: All right.
6	We're back on record now at 1:56. You may proceed, Mr.
7	DeCelle.
8	MR. DECELLE: Thank you. The purpose of both
9	charts is to show the relatively stable nature of the
10	industry and the fact, again, that production has been
11	relatively stable as well as consumption by American
12	consumers for extended period of time, just to give you
13	an overview of the beer industry, which is the primary
14	consumer of hops, as most of you folks know. Given that
15	background and demonstrated by the charts, profitability
16	of our major members has come from extraordinary efforts
17	to reduce costs and to gain efficiencies at all stages
18	of the production process. Substantial brewer
19	consolidation has occurred over the last several years.
20	In our own organization just since '94, when I joined,
21	we've gone from five major brewers to three. So our
22	members have not been immune to the challenges of the
23	free market and we can certainly emphasize with the
24	situation facing our fellow industry members in the hops
25	those who cultivate hops. The brewing industry has a
	York Stenographic Services, Inc.

```
1
       long history of working with U.S. hops growers to expand
       the variety and quality of hops used in our industry.
2
3
       Over the years we've supported various efforts,
       University of Oregon, the University of California
4
5
       system and elsewhere as well as many private initiatives
6
       to improve, as I said, the quality and variety.
       Cultivation in this country dates back over 1000 years
7
8
       in Europe and early -- in German and Dutch settlements
       in New York and the east grew hops shortly after their
9
10
       arrival. And larger scale production began here in the
       early 1800's. Began on the east coast and moved west
11
       over time with the growth of our country. As evidenced
12
13
       by the states that are involved in this marketing order,
14
       the primary growth area of hops in the United States is
        right here in the northwest. International competition,
15
        however, is intense with the U.S producing about 25
16
17
        percent of the worldwide crop and substantial production
        in Europe, Asia, Africa and Australia.
                                                The proposed
18
        marketing order presupposes that an administrative
19
        system can be developed to deal with structural economic
20
        forces that have resulted in an oversupply of hops.
21
        such effort guided by the Federal Government, is
22
        contrary to the current administrations recently stated
23
        Agricultural policy that recognizes that -- and I'm
24
        quoting here -- "The market places the best guide for
25
                         York Stenographic Services, Inc.
```

1	allocating resources and provides the most objective
2	reward for efficiency and good management." And that
3	comes from a USDA statement entitled "Food and
4	Agriculture Policy, Taking Stock for the New Century."
5	It came out earlier this year, 2003. The current
6	business and social situation confronting American
7	farmers is apply described as a competitive, consumer-
8	driven, and rapidly changing, highly interdependent,
9	lending the efforts of many industries to add value to
10	farm sector products. As the sole consumer of hops,
11	brewers are primarily responsible for adding value to
12	the crops of hops growers and other agricultural
13	producers. The future of the U.S. hops industry is tied
14	directly to many factors beyond the reach of
15	agricultural marketing orders. Those factors include
16	growth, product changes, technological advances in the
17	worldwide brewing industry, international competition,
18	and crop yields as well as exchange rates. Prior U.S.
19	experience with hops marketing orders shows that they
20	have not provided effective, long-term relief to
21	American growers. Since 1938, the Department of
22	Agriculture has administered three different marketing
23	orders that applied to growers in the same region that
24	would be covered under the proposed order being
25	considered today. The first hops marketing order
	York Stenographic Services, Inc.

remained in place from 1938 until 1994. The second was
implemented in 1949 and lasted until 1952. And the
third was enforced between 1966 and 1986. All three
helped all three failed to help U.S. farms as I said.
Artificial constraints on acreage, quota systems and
purchase pool arrangements simply did not adequately
anticipate the effects of external market forces in the
past and they will not be able to do so in the current
commercial environment. Beyond the lessons of history
and international market forces beyond our control, a
fundamental goal of marketing orders and U.S. policy
would be thwarted by imposition of a marketing order of
this time, and that is the maintenance of high-quality
produce. Brewing is an art form that combines centuries
of tradition with modern methods of production and
quality control. U.S. and international brewers have
established their respective reputations through decades
of effort and attention to detail. A marketing order
could hurt growers who have worked to meet the standards
of specific brewers or to develop new varieties to meet
the demands of our nations craft breweries, which often
produce unique seasonal products. The marketing order
would set back the efforts of growers to meet basic
customer needs, such as quality and variety. Earlier
this year, the USDA requested alternatives to the
York Stenographic Services, Inc.

1	proposed marketing order. At the time, and again for
2	the hearing record today, the Beer Institute
3	respectfully submits that no form of marketing order
4	will alleviate the current market place conditions but
5	would only serve to disrupt and damage the industry and
6	that the department should not establish a new order.
7	We would be pleased to provide the Department with any
8	additional background information on the brewing
9	industry that will aid in your decision-making process,
10	and I appreciate the opportunity to appear here today.
11	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Mr. DeCelle, I'd
12	actually like to have your statement as an exhibit as
13	well as your having read it into the record.
14	MR. DECELLE: Okay.
15	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Do you have any
16	objection to that?
17	MR. DECELLE: No, I don't, Your Honor.
18	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: All right.
19	MR. DECELLE: If you'd like to have it.
20	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: I just wanted to
21	make sure it is accurately reflected and the fact that
22	you have it typed out I think would ensure that.
23	MR. DECELLE: Okay. Thank you, Your Honor.
24	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: All right. I'm
25	going to mark Mr. DeCelle's statement as Exhibit 18.
	York Stenographic Services, Inc.
	34 North George St., York, PA 17401 - (717) 854-0077

1	MR. DECEMBE. This one has some markings on
2	it. Can I provide you with a
3	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: You may. Can
4	you do that
5	MR. DECELLE:typed
6	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE:before you
7	have to leave today?
8	MR. DECELLE: Yes. I can.
9	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: That would be
10	great. All right. Mr. DeCelle is now available for
11	cross-examination. Who would like to begin? Ms.
12	Deskins?
13	MS. DESKINS: I just had a couple of
14	questions. On those two exhibits that you passed out,
15	where did you get the information to make those
16	exhibits?
17	MR. DECELLE: The information comes from a
18	variety of sources. Beer is heavily taxed and
19	regulated, as you know. And the tax and trade bureau of
20	the treasury department is one major source. First of
21	all, let me back up a little. The brewers are the major
22	source. The major domestic brewers provide the Beer
23	Institute with volume statistics that we publish on a
24	monthly basis. And what we do is take the barrelage of
25	the major companies and importers and then make an
	York Stenographic Services, Inc.
	34 North George St., York, PA 17401 - (717) 854-0077

1	estimate of what the 1800 smaller brewers and craft
2	brewers in the country produce and then check that
3	against government figures for tax collection purposes,
4	both federal and state.
5	MS. DESKINS: Okay. And both of these
6	exhibits were made by the Beer Institute?
7	MR. DECELLE: Correct.
8	MS. DESKINS: Okay. And also you do you
9	have figures on the sales between countries other than
10	the U.S. of hops?
11	MR. DECELLE: We do not that I know of. A
12	lot of our import and export information comes from the
13	Commerce Department but I am not sure that they break
14	out the hops I can find that out for you certainly
15	within the next few days before the hearing record
16	closes.
17	MS. DESKINS: That's not necessarily. I was
18	just wondering if you might have known that information,
19	but you don't need to look that up.
20	MR. DECELLE: Okay.
21	MS. DESKINS: I have no further questions.
22	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Thank you, Ms.
23	Deskins. Ms. Dec.
24	MS. DEC: I have a couple. Mr. DeCelle, I
25	don't know a whole lot about brewing beer so if you

1	would give me a little bit of background. Can you hear
2	me okay? In a let's say a gallon of beer, how much
3	hops is used to produce beer? I don't have any sense of
4	the proportions.
5	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Just a moment.
6	Before you answer, I'm not sure the people in the back
7	of the room could hear you, Ms. Dec. Would you repeat
8	your question? Just be a little closer to the mike.
9	MS. DEC: Okay. I was wondering, as far as an
10	ingredient in beer, how much how many hops, how much
11	hops is used in brewing beer? Do you understand that?
12	MR. DECELLE: Yes. But there are significant
13	variations from one type of beer to another and there's
14	also some federally recommended ratios for product
15	identification purposes. I don't have that with me. I
16	actually have it some I probably have it in my
17	briefcase, the recommended government numbers. But you
18	will have a couple of witnesses from or member
19	companies that could give you a more specific quantity
20	ratio. But I can tell you that there's a significant
21	difference. For example, the light beer category is an
22	area that's grown from non-existence in the 1970's to
23	over 40 percent of the total market. And light beer, by
24	its nature, requires less hops. On the other hand,
25	there's a lot of small producers that use a lot larger
	York Stenographic Services, Inc.
	34 North George St., York, PA 17401 - (717) 854-0077

1	amounts of hops in their ales and heavier beer products.
2	Hops is basically the spice of beer so they have a
3	tend to have fuller taste products. And then there are
4	the flavored malt beverage sector, which is relatively
5	new. It's about three percent of the total market,
6	which use very little hops at all; just a minimum to
7	meet the federal standards.
8	MS. DEC: I believe in your testimony you made
9	a statement that any marketing order would thwart the
10	efforts to provide brewers with the quality they need.
11	Could you explain a little bit what you meant by that?
12	MR. DECELLE: Yes. Several of our member
13	companies have informed us that they have established
14	relationships with suppliers either to meet specific
15	variety needs or other standards, quality control
16	standards that the brewers have established. And if
17	that's true of a major brewer and a large consumer of
18	those hops, then the only way that one of their long-
19	term providers could continue to do so would be to
20	acquire base from another grower, as I understand the
21	process.
22	MS. DEC: Okay. Thank you.
23	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Mr. Olson.
24	MR. OLSON: Thank you, Your Honor. I was
25	wondering if you could provide some general statistics

1	in terms of the hop usage, how much of it is for
2	domestic beer production comes from hops grown within
3	the proposed production area and also I was wondering if
4	you had any access to information regarding those years
5	under the marketing order, whether there were different
6	percentages of utilization of domestic-grown hops for
7	beer production in the United States?
8	MR. DECELLE: The answer to the first part of
9	your question, I would respectfully defer to the brewer
10	representatives who actually purchase, because I don't
11	know the breakdown. I'm told that we spend we
12	purchase roughly half of the U.S. hops production, which
13	and I'm not aware of any significant production
14	outside the three-state area. But as far as the
15	imports, no, I'm not certain of that and that varies
16	from company to company. And at least one and possibly
17	two or three will be represented here.
18	MR. OLSON: In terms of trends, has it
19	remained relatively stable in recent years?
20	MR. DECELLE: That I can't respond to
21	that. But the second part of your question, can you
22	restate it. I know you had a second
23	MR. OLSON: Yeah. What I was trying to get
24	at is whether you had any information regarding whether
25	there has been changes in the percent utilization of
	York Stenographic Services, Inc.

1	domestic hops for domestic brewers when a marketing
2	order was in place or was not in place.
3	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Okay. If we're
4	able to find well, I know some of the statistics
5	production statistics that are kept by the tax and trade
6	bureau of the treasury department include hops purchases
7	and I'm pretty confident that those numbers go back to
8	that '66 to '86 period. So it's possible that we could
9	figure out the answer to that question for that period.
10	But I don't have it with me.
11	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Thank you. Ms.
12	Finn.
13	MS. FINN: I did have one question. I just
14	have one question, a follow-up to Ms. Dec's question
15	about how much hops is needed in beer. Since the
16	consumers are demanding or consumer trends are more
17	towards preferring lighter beers
18	MR. DECELLE: Correct.
19	MS. FINN:which require less hops, has the
20	trend been that less hops are needed in making beer than
21	say there were it was 20 years ago?
22	MR. DECELLE: Yes. I'm not sure that that's
23	the only reason, but it's certainly true that less hops
24	are needed for a substantial amount of the U.S.
25	production today and that those brands didn't even exist
	York Stenographic Services, Inc.
	34 North George St., York, PA 17401 - (717) 854-0077

1	say 30 years ago and that during the while the other
2	marketing order was enforced during that period.
3	MS. FINN: Thank you.
4	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Dr. Hinman.
5	DR. HINMAN: Yes. Mr. DeCelle, you mentioned
6	that you have a the Institute puts out a monthly
7	publication. Is that correct?
8	MR. DECELLE: Yes, sir.
9	DR. HINMAN: And is this data to submit
10	something that's published in there? The reason I'm
11	asking is I guess two things I could get from that is
12	would you be able to actual supply us with the actual
13	numbers behind these graphs, just a table, and then
14	secondly an alternative to that or in addition to that
15	would there be a series of maybe annual summaries of
16	those publications that you could submit as evidence
17	that could also improve the completeness of the economic
18	record?
19	MR. DECELLE: Yes. We publish full tables
20	with the break out of the information reflected in the
21	charts. And actually, we no longer publish since
22	about '99 we don't publish it any more. It's on our
23	website, but nevertheless, we can get you the more
24	detailed numbers and fuller charts explaining the year-
25	to-year trends.
	York Stenographic Services, Inc.

1	DR. HINMAN: Okay. And then a second
2	question. And this may be answered by you said other
3	members are going to testify. But the in the brewing
4	process, we've heard about, you know, this whole hops
5	and pellets and extract. And could you explain a bit
6	about some of the changes in the brewing process from,
7	you know, a trade association brewer's point of view
8	about how the changing needs and utilization of each
9	type how it has changed and how it affected sort of
10	the demand for hops?
11	MR. DECELLE: I can't tell you how it affects
12	the overall demand. I can tell you that each company
13	each of our major companies as well and there's
14	almost an endless variety among the smaller brewers
15	uses hops at various stages in the production process.
16	Sometimes two or three times in the brewing process hops
17	are added. And I'm aware of one major brewer that uses
18	almost exclusively extracts and one that uses almost
19	exclusively raw hops. So there's quite a variation
20	there. And that's proprietary and maybe not
21	propriety in the sense of what they use, but each
22	process is different from and varies widely among the
23	brewers.
24	DR. HINMAN: Okay. Thank you.
25	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Before I ask for
	York Stenographic Services, Inc.
	34 North George St., York, PA 17401 - (717) 854-0077

1	further cross-examination, Mr. DeCelle, is today the
2	only day you'll be present at this hearing? We're hear
3	all this week and in Yakima, Washington all of next
4	week.
5	MR. DECELLE: Yes, Your Honor. I've been
6	traveling for a week and I have seven children. So I'm
7	already in deep, hot water.
8	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: How would
9	propose to furnish to us by the end of next week any
10	follow-up information based on the questions you
11	fielded?
12	MR. DECELLE: Well, we'd be happy and try to
13	fulfill any process that you suggest to us to get the
14	information in your hands and into the record. Would it
15	be possible for members any of our members who are
16	testifying to submit it or is there an alternative that
17	you have used in the past that
18	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Perhaps it would
19	be best for you to supply it through witnesses still to
20	come even though they might not be able to answer cross-
21	examination about it if they could represent that you
22	had forwarded it. But you would need to attach, if you
23	have a statistic or something, some statement as to why
24	you are furnishing it. In other words, this is
25	responsive to the inquiry about
	York Stenographic Services, Inc.

1	MR. DECELLE: Okay. So Dr. Hinman's
2	question, for example
3	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Yes.
4	MR. DECELLE: Okay. Is there any process for
5	accepting written follow-up or
6	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Yes. We could
7	certainly accept it. We would rather have written
8	statements while a person is available to be cross-
9	examined about them.
10	MR. DECELLE: Certainly.
11	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: But I think it
12	would be better for us to have whatever information you
13	can provide even if you're not here to field questions
14	rather than not to have the information at all.
15	MR. DECELLE: Okay. Thank you, Your Honor.
16	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Do you have
17	before we go on, I know there are other questions for
18	you. Do you want to clarify with any of the government
19	questioners what is it they need or do you recall pretty
20	much the tenor of their questions.
21	MR. DECELLE: With response to the regular
22	the hops usage question, I do believe that I could
23	provide that here while I'm still with us and as well as
24	my written statement. I think Dr. Hinman's question and
25	request for the follow-up supporting information is
	York Stenographic Services, Inc.
	34 North George St., York, PA 17401 - (717) 854-0077

1	that the only other one pending?
2	DR. HINMAN: No. I asked for either/or or
3	actually, the numbers behind the particular graphs, but
4	if you can be more complete to submit entire if you
5	have annual [inaudible] summaries that would include
6	this that would certainly be welcome as well for a
7	number of years back again to complete the historical
8	records since you have access to industry data from your
9	members that the government would not have.
10	MR. DECELLE: Correct. Yes. Okay. So you
11	want also a more comprehensive survey of the industry
12	data.
13	DR. HINMAN: Yes. That is correct.
14	MR. DECELLE: Okay.
15	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Dr. Hinman, what
16	years would you like him to focus on?
17	DR. HINMAN: Well, perhaps the years covered
18	in the graph. If you have for instance, obviously
19	monthly reports would be if you have annual reports
20	covering, you know, this period back as far as your
21	graph, that would be very helpful.
22	MR. DECELLE: Okay.
23	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: All right.
24	Additional cross-examination of Mr. DeCelle. Mr. Moody?
25	MR. MOODY: Just one quick area of inquiry.
	York Stenographic Services, Inc.

1	On the switch to the increasing demand for light beer is
2	that change in consumer preference something that's well
3	known to the hop producing part of the industry?
4	MR. DECELLE: Well, I can't speak for them.
5	I would assume it is because it certainly affects both
6	the varieties that are used as well as the overall
7	volume.
8	MR. MOODY: And that increase in market
9	share for light beer has been a fairly gradual change?
10	MR. DECELLE: Well, it's gradual but it's
11	dramatic. It's gradual since because it's occurred
12	since the 1970's, but it's fairly steady and upward
13	fairly steady upward trend at the expense. As you can
14	see, the overall domestic production is relatively
15	stable. So it's basically within the total beer volume
16	category that a substitution for light beer for premium
17	beers has occurred over time. And you can it's very
18	dramatic when you look over the whole period. It comes
19	close to a perfect substitution.
20	MR. MOODY: Right. But in your view, is
21	that the sort of change that the hops industry can
22	respond to according to free market forces without
23	causing undue disruption or chaos?
24	MR. DECELLE: Yes. I believe they can. And
25	again, we have our members have very long standing
	York Stenographic Services, Inc.

1	relationships with the industry. And I assume that
2	there are fairly well known trends.
3	MR. MOODY: Thank you.
4	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Other cross-
5	examination for Mr. DeCelle? Let's start with Mr.
6	Monahan.
7	MR. MONAHAN: Thank you, Your Honor. Brendar
8	Monahan for the record. Your Honor, I have a couple of
9	questions and I believe the Hop Growers to my left have
10	some questions as well. I would just ask, Mr. DeCelle,
11	I understand from your statement that your members
12	include the producers of over 90 percent of the beer
13	sold in the United States. Is that right?
14	MR. DECELLE: That's correct.
15	MR. MONAHAN: How long have you been with the
16	Beer Institute?
17	MR. DECELLE: Nine years.
18	MR. MONAHAN: What did you do before that?
19	MR. DECELLE: I was a staffer for two members
20	of congress and two congressional committees.
21	MR. MONAHAN: Okay. Is it fair to say that
22	your involvement with the beer industry started nine
23	years ago?
24	MR. DECELLE: Correct.
25	MR. MONAHAN: And you have no experience in
	York Stenographic Services, Inc.
	34 North George St., York, PA 17401 - (717) 854-0077

1	the actual hop industry in terms of growing or handling
2	hops. Is that accurate?
3	MR. DECELLE: That's correct.
4	MR. MONAHAN: You have no personal knowledge
5	of the way that the prior hop marketing orders were
6	administered. Is that right?
7	MR. DECELLE: Other than what I've read in
8	various proceedings of the industry from different
9	periods.
10	MR. MONAHAN: Okay. One of your remarks had
11	to do with the efficiency or success of the prior hop
12	marketing orders. And if I can quote you, I believe you
13	said all three failed to help U.S. Farmers. Is that
14	right?
15	MR. DECELLE: Correct.
16	MR. MONAHAN: You actually weren't involved
17	with those hop marketing orders. Were you?
18	MR. DECELLE: No. I was not.
19	MR. MONAHAN: That is information that you
20	believe you've required through something you've read.
21	MR. DECELLE: Correct.
22	MR. MONAHAN: One of the statements you made
23	was that your members do your members pay a fee by
24	the way.
25	MR. DECELLE: Yes.
	N. A. Carrier and L. Carrier and Land

1	MR. MONAHAN: Okay. Your fee-paying members
2	have been successful at reducing costs. Is that right?
3	MR. DECELLE: That's correct.
4	MR. MONAHAN: And one of their costs is hops.
5	Is that right?
6	MR. DECELLE: Yes.
7	MR. MONAHAN: So it's fair to say that
8	they've successfully reduced the amount of money they
9	pay for hops. Is that right?
10	MR. DECELLE: Well, I'm not aware of their
11	individual transactions, but I know we have supplier
12	members as well as brewer members and there's enormous
13	cost-cutting pressure for anybody doing business in the
14	United States these days. And our members, as I pointed
15	out, are all here pretty much.
16	MR. MONAHAN: Okay. Are you aware what the
17	cost of production is for hops? Have you ever reviewed
18	numbers like that?
19	MR. DECELLE: No.
20	MR. MONAHAN: Do you know if your members pay
21	for hops more or less than the cost of production?
22	MR. DECELLE: No. I do not.
23	MR. MONAHAN: If in fact they were paying
24	less than the cost production that would be something in
25	their financial interest to preserve. Is that right?
	York Stenographic Services, Inc.
	34 North George St., York, PA 17401 - (717) 854-0077

1	MR. DECELLE: Well, it might be in their
2	financial interests, but I'm not sure it would be in
3	their long-term interest. I mean these are long-term
4	relationships that are essential to the quality of their
5	products. So I think it's more a matter of an equitable
6	business relationship as opposed to attempting to get
7	something for less than cost of production.
8	MR. MONAHAN: Do you think that might be one
9	of the reasons your organization is opposing the
10	marketing order?
11	MR. DECELLE: No. I think the factors that I
12	touched on before are more important. As I said, it's
13	an essential ingredient in the process and the idea that
14	the hypothetical that I tried to laid out where a
15	producer who had been successful in meeting the needs of
16	a major brewer there's been a lot of consolidation. So
17	it's certainly plausible that successful producer would
18	be forced to buy, you know essentially buy the right
19	to meet one of his customer's needs from another grower.
20	MR. MONAHAN: Who's Jeffery Becker?
21	MR. DECELLE: He is the president of the Beer
22	Institute.
23	MR. MONAHAN: Are you aware that he submitted
24	a letter to the AMS in the course of the comment period?
25	MR. DECELLE: Yes, sir.
	York Stenographic Services, Inc.
	34 North George St., York, PA 17401 - (717) 854-0077

1	MR. MONAHAN: In fact, your written remarks
2	and spoken remarks today borrow largely from his letter.
3	Is that right?
4	MR. DECELLE: That's correct.
5	MR. MONAHAN: One of the statements that he
6	made and that you made is that you believe the proposed
7	marketing order will not sufficiently deal with the
8	"structural economic forces that have resulted in an
9	oversupply of hops." I want to break that down into two
10	parts. Is it true that your members believe there is an
11	oversupply of hops?
12	MR. DECELLE: Well, the yes. I would say
13	it's true we believe that.
14	MR. MONAHAN: Okay. What are the structural
15	economic forces?
16	* * *
17	[Off the record.]
18	[On the record.]
19	* * *
20	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Thank you.
21	We're back on record at 2:25 p.m. Mr. Monahan, would
22	you start that question again?
23	MR. MONAHAN: Thank you, Your Honor. Mr.
24	DeCelle, what are the structural economic forces that
25	have resulted in the oversupply of hops?
	York Stenographic Services, Inc.

1	MR. DECELLE: I would say on the consumer
2	side that temperance and health considerations have led
3	to that leveling in the per capita consumption and
4	actually decline in per capita consumption and leveling
5	in the overall domestic production volume. I would say
6	product taste with respect to light beer and flavored
7	malt beverages. I would say the increasing
8	internationalization of the industry, i.e., that there
9	are a variety of different business agreements among
10	major international producers. And I think those are
11	probably the most significant.
12	MR. MONAHAN: How about development of new
13	varieties of hops with higher yields, higher alpha
14	levels?
15	MR. DECELLE: That's not an area that I'm as
16	familiar with. I'm aware that that has made the brewing
17	process more efficient or at least hop usage more
18	efficient, but I don't know the impact of that.
19	MR. MONAHAN: Those are all the questions I
20	have, Your Honor.
21	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Thank you, Mr.
22	Monahan. Who would like to begin for the Committee
23	Proponents Committee. Mr. Desserault.
24	MR. K. DESSERAULT: Ken Desserault. Yes. I
25	only have one question. Mr. Monahan took care of most
	York Stenographic Services, Inc.
	34 North George St., York, PA 17401 - (717) 854-0077

1	of the other stuff I had. And the only one that I had
2	is do you have any you know you stated that the other
3	three marketing orders were ineffective. Do you have
4	any reason to believe why the last order lasted for 20
5	years if it was ineffective?
6	MR. DECELLE: Well, in my reading of the
7	situation, I believe in that third marketing order the -
8	- first of all, according to one of the publications
9	that I read on the subject, a great deal of fluctuation
10	had occurred in demand because of various crop failures
11	elsewhere in the world and that marketing order was
12	routinely subverted for that reason, folks, and
13	extremely difficult to enforce. So that's the extent of
14	my knowledge.
15	MR. K. DESSERAULT: Are you saying there were
16	crop failures consistently during the 20-year period?
17	MR. DECELLE: No. At different points and
18	that the U.S. growers were able to use both draw down on
19	their own reserves and that in some cases the author
20	accused them of violating the orders.
21	MR. K. DESSERAULT: That's all I have.
22	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Thank you.
23	Others on the Proponents Committee? Mr. Roy?
24	MR. ROY: You made some statements towards
25	that hop utilization has been increased, which leaves me
	York Stenographic Services, Inc.

1	to believe that they're using less hops in the beer. Is
2	that correct?
3	MR. DECELLE: I'm sorry. Hop utilization you
4	said
5	MR. ROY: Yeah. You made some you made a
6	statement about increasing hop utilization being more
7	efficient, I guess, is the word I heard.
8	MR. DECELLE: Correct.
9	MR. ROY: Do you consider that trend to
10	continue into the future?
11	MR. DECELLE: That I don't know. You would
12	have to ask I would defer to the brewer people who
13	have better technical knowledge.
14	MR. ROY: Do keep any records average usage of
15	hops per barrel of beer?
16	MR. DECELLE: No. And as my understanding is
17	that that varies markedly
18	MR. ROY: I mean as an average
19	MR. DECELLE:although I
20	MR. ROY:as an average for the United
21	States?
22	MR. DECELLE: Oh, I have the only thing I
23	have along those lines is the guidance from the Treasury
24	Department on hops, which I will provide for the record.

MR. ROY: So that would be -- okay. So we'll

25

1	see the average usage of hops per barrel of beer over
2	MR. DECELLE: Well, I can't say that it's an
3	average. I can say it's their guidance for
4	MR. ROY: I think
5	MR. DECELLE:something that meets the
6	standard for beer as classified
7	MR. ROY: Oh, so just a federal
8	MR. DECELLE: Federal law.
9	MR. ROY:regulation you mean.
10	MR. DECELLE: Correct.
11	MR. ROY: But is it not government figures
12	that show the usage of hops in total and that could be
13	cross-referenced with the amount of beer produced in the
14	United States?
15	MR. DECELLE: Yes. I believe that can be
16	done using either the Treasury Department numbers or
17	MR. ROY: Could you do you have access to
18	those numbers?
19	MR. DECELLE: I do. And I suppose we could -
20	- what I can't tell you for certain is whether that
21	information is assembled in any kind of a format. Right
22	now I know the way to access it would be on the Treasury
23	Department website or in one of their older publications
24	for back years.
25	MR. ROY: Would you could you provide us
	York Stenographic Services, Inc.

1	with that information?
2	MR. DECELLE: I can try within whatever
3	constraints
4	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Mr. Roy, what
5	years are you interested in?
6	MR. ROY: I think there's been some reference
7	to the years from '45 on. I'm not sure if we can go
8	back that far, but as far back at least I think prior to
9	the existing marketing order in '66. So if we go back
10	to 1950 to the present I think that would be adequate.
11	MS. DESKINS: Judge Clifton, just for the
12	record, Mr. DeCelle's going to give that to one of his
13	members who will then introduce it as an exhibit. Is
14	that what's going to happen?
15	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: I think that's
16	probably the only avenue Mr. DeCelle has to get it to us
17	while we're still in this hearing since he won't be back
18	personally.
19	MS. DESKINS: Okay.
20	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Back to Mr. Roy.
21	What is it if you could tell me again
22	MR. ROY: I think that we can look at some
23	long-term trends of the usage of hops in beer, which is
24	declining. And I think that has merit in this
25	discussion.

1	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: All right. So
2	any data that would tend to show the usage of hops in
3	beer 1950 to the present.
4	MR. ROY: Correct.
5	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: All right.
6	MR. ROY: Thank you.
7	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: You're welcome,
8	Mr. Roy. Yes. Tell me your name again please.
9	MR. NEWHOUSE: Thank you, my name is Dan
10	Newhouse.
11	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Thank you.
12	MR. NEWHOUSE: I'm a member of the Proponents
13	Committee. Mr. DeCelle was that your name? Excuse
14	me. I didn't quite hear it.
15	MR. DECELLE: Yes, sir.
16	MR. NEWHOUSE: Thank you. In your comments
17	pertaining to the long standing relationship that many
18	growers have with their customers, you made a statement,
19	and I'm sorry I can't quote you exactly, that quality as
20	well as availability of the product would suffer if a
21	producer had to perform any market that had a marketing
22	order involved in it. Could you expand on that and
23	explain to me how that would come about, how that would
24	happen?
25	MR. DECELLE: I'm not sure that I what I

l	was trying to articulate was the idea that a grower who
2	had striven to meet particular quality standards of a
3	brewer that it was an unfair situation for that grower
4	to have to purchase the right to grow an adequate supply
5	to meet a brewer's need. So I did not mean to say that
6	there was an automatic relationship between quality and
7	the marketing order if you will. Is that
8	MR. NEWHOUSE: That is what you used the
9	word quality in your remarks and so that's I was just
10	curious what would make you say that.
11	MR. DECELLE: Well, the idea was that a
12	grower who had met the quality standards of a particular
13	brewer would suffer unfairly if he or she were not able
14	to adequately supply that brewer. They would have to
15	purchase the right to grow an adequate supply for their
16	customer. So in other words, their efforts to attain
17	high-quality standards for their crop would, in effect,
18	be impeded by the existence of a marketing order.
19	MR. NEWHOUSE: The act of acquiring the extra
20	base allotment would impair the ability of the grower to
21	produce a quality crop is what you're saying?
22	MR. DECELLE: No. I'm saying that they would
23	be unfairly treated in that scenario, that the grower
24	who had worked hard in the free market to meet quality
25	standards and therefore had attained a given market
	York Stenographic Services, Inc.
	24 North Coargo St. Vork DA 17401 (717) 254 0077

1	share, might not be able to grow that market share
2	without buying the base from another grower.
3	MR. NEWHOUSE: Okay. Thank you.
4	MR. DECELLE: Sure.
5	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Were there any
6	other questions from the Proponents Committee?
7	MR. SMITH: I have one, Your Honor.
8	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Let's see.
9	You're Mr. Gasseling? Oh, you're speaking.
10	MR. SMITH: Yeah.
11	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Mr. Gasseling
12	was moving his microphone. Go ahead. Mr. Smith.
13	MR. SMITH: Mr. DeCeile, would you say at
14	this time that your that the members of the Beer
15	Institute are satisfied with what I'll call, for lack of
16	a better term, the unregulated market that we have for
17	hops or supply of hops?
18	MR. DECELLE: I believe they are. That's the
19	information that's been communicated to me and the
20	reason that our major members who help develop our
21	policy statement have given.
22	MR. SMITH: Okay. And would you say that
23	the members of the Beer Institute are currently
24	satisfied with the quality of the hops that they're
25	receiving from the U.S. industry?
	York Stenographic Services, Inc.
	34 North George St., York, PA 17401 - (717) 854-0077

1	MR. DECELLE: I believe they are.
2	MR. SMITH: And they're satisfied with the
3	price that they're paying for those hops currently?
	MR. DECELLE: I can't comment on an
4	
5	individual brewer's satisfaction or lack thereof with
6	MR. SMITH: But they didn't indicate
7	MR. DECELLE:price or
8	MR. SMITH:dissatisfaction with it.
9	Did they?
10	MR. DECELLE: No. They did not.
11	MR. SMITH: Are you familiar or aware of
12	how many domestic hops varieties are delivered to our
13	nation's brewers every year?
14	MR. DECELLE: I don't have the total number.
15	I have some compendiums that list them, but I have not
16	counted them.
17	MR. SMITH: So would it surprise you to
18	know that there is over 25 domestically grown varieties
19	that are delivered every year?
20	MR. DECELLE: No. I wish I had guessed
21	because that's what I was going to say, 20 or so.
22	MR. SMITH: Would it surprise you to know
23	that there's several of those varieties that are grown
24	by only one grower?
25	MR. DECELLE: No. That wouldn't surprise me.
	York Stenographic Services, Inc.

I	MR. SMITH: Okay. So if your current
2	members are satisfied with the unregulated system, would
3	it surprise you or your members to know that, in fact,
4	there is a concerted effort on behalf on behalf of
5	those growers to balance the supply of those specialty
6	varieties for the market?
7	MR. DECELLE: When you say to balance, do you
8	mean do you have some kind of my view of this is
9	that the varieties over time maybe not every single
10	year to year would develop or the demand for
11	particular varieties would develop with the industry and
12	with the success of particular brands that used a
13	particular form of hops. That's why I wouldn't be
14	surprised, as you stated, that you know, one major
15	producer produced one variety or something like that
16	because the industry is there's only 25 brands that
17	make up about 80 percent of the total beer.
18	MR. SMITH: Right. But actually the
19	question was would it surprise you to know that, in
20	fact, the growers of those varieties sit down every year
21	and look at the supply of those varieties, the amount
22	that was moved into the market place and adjust their
23	supply for ensuing years up and down in order to make
24	sure that the correct quantity of hops is available for
25	those brewers? Would that surprise you to know that?
	York Stenographic Services, Inc.
	34 North George St., York, PA 17401 - (717) 854-0077

1	MR. DECELLE: No. I assume it takes place.
2	MR. SMITH: So basically then the current
3	system that's unregulated actually does have some
4	regulation involved in it. Maybe not formal regulation,
5	but that growers are reacting to the demand for specific
6	varieties.
7	MR. DECELLE: That growers yes. That's
8	correct. I would concur with that.
9	MR. SMITH: Thank you.
10	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Mr. Gasseling.
11	MR. GASSELING: Yes. My name's Tom Gasseling.
12	A couple questions. You alluded to the fact that a
13	grower who has a relationship because of this marketing
14	order might not be able to continue that relationship.
15	Are you aware of any specific instance where given this
16	marketing order be implemented the way it's set up that
17	that would, in fact, happen to any grower that's growing
18	hops right now in the United States or is this just a
19	supposition that it could happen?
20	MR. DECELLE: Well, it's just a supposition
21	that it could happen.
22	MR. GASSELING: Okay.
23	MR. DECELLE: Given what you said this
24	morning, I don't think they have the methodology
25	established yet or at least it hasn't been
	York Stenographic Services, Inc.
	34 North George St., York, PA 17401 - (717) 854-0077

1	MR. GASSELING. WELL, the methodology
2	MR. DECELLE:put on the record. So I
3	don't know how it would work in reality, but it makes
4	sense given the fact that there are three major brewers
5	and just given the structure of our industry that there
6	would be certain brewers with established relationships
7	that could be harmed as a result of the marketing order
8	or even the growers could be harmed because they would
9	have to purchase base allotment from another grower.
10	MR. GASSELING: Okay. Another question. You
11	stated that there was a failure of the prior marketing
12	orders. If you look on the table of the statistics
13	hop statistics that were supplied on Table 1, if you
14	look
15	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Is this Exhibit
16	5?
17	MR. GASSELING: It's yes. It's Exhibit 5.
18	MR. DECELLE: The statistical overview?
19	MR. GASSELING: Yes. It says the
20	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: And which page
21	please?
22	MR. GASSELING: On page 1. If you look at the
23	last marketing order from 1966 to 1986 and you look at
24	the total production, with the exception of 1980, '81
25	and '82 and those can be attributed to the crop failures
	York Stenographic Services, Inc.
	34 North George St., York, PA 17401 - (717) 854-0077

1	in Europe, wouldn't you agree that the production
2	numbers in those 20 years are relatively stable?
3	MR. DECELLE: Yes. They certainly are.
4	MR. GASSELING: And then if we turn the page
5	onto page 2 and we look from 1994 well, in fact, if
6	you go even with starting with '87, after the marketing
7	order went out on page 1, we fluctuate from 50 million
8	all the way up to 70 almost 79 million and we're back
9	down to 58 million. Do you consider that to be stable
10	production?
11	MR. DECELLE: Well, they're not these are
12	long-term trends.
13	MR. GASSELING: Well, that's exactly my point.
14	That's what I'm getting to. I'm taking a 20-year period
15	when there was a marketing order. You said it's
16	relatively stable production. I'm asking you do you
17	think from and if you want to take 20 years I
18	guess I'm not very good at math so go back from 2002 20
19	years, whatever that number is I don't know would
20	it be 1982. Go to '82, but you'd have to go passed that
21	so you can't. So start at 1987. And my question is do
22	you consider those production levels to be relatively
23	stable from 1987 to 2002?
24	MR. DECELLE: No. Well, I mean there's
25	considerable fluctuations. But these numbers, in and of
	York Stenographic Services, Inc.
	34 North George St., York, PA 17401 - (717) 854-0077

1	themselves, I mean in the '66 to '86 period, for
2	example, brewer total production climbed considerably
3	in that period driven primarily by U.S. demographics.
4	So there are all kinds of potential explanations for
5	these fluctuation, both long and short term, that I
6	think are certainly explainable without reference to the
7	marketing order.
8	MR. GASSELING: Well, the actual if you look
9	at your domestic brewery output, the actual big
10	increases came after '86. I mean I'm just looking at
11	your number here. Domestic brewery output from 1980 on
12	through to '86, yes, it increased, but from '86 on to
13	the peak of '90's when there was a huge
14	MR. DECELLE: Well
15	MR. GASSELING:increase in beer output.
16	MR. DECELLE: '90 is explainable by the
17	excise. The federal government doubled it excise tax
18	increase effective January 1, 1991. And the reason for
19	that is a huge amount of year-end loading in that year
20	to avoid the effect of the excise tax increase. So that
21	year is an anomaly.
22	MR. GASSELING: Okay. But
23	MR. DECELLE: But nevertheless, the period
24	through the '60's and '70's were a stronger growth
25	because the demographics year to year improved markedly

I	with the Baby Boom population being in their primary 21
2	to 35 drinking years.
3	MR. GASSELING: Are you aware of any time
4	during 1986 or at any time in these years on this where
5	the U.S. hop industry actually shorted the U.S. brewing
6	industry of product?
7	MR. DECELLE: No. I'm not aware of that at
8	all, sir.
9	MR. GASSELING: So as far as you know, we've
10	never the industry has never done that. But I want
11	to clarify because I think this is a critical point.
12	You're making an argument that the other marketing order
13	didn't work. And by your own testimony you've stated
14	that during that period production was stable.
15	Irregardless of what the brewing trade did, we did
16	increase a little bit as the beer because we had
17	changes in varieties and everything, but the production
18	was relatively stable. And by your own statement, after
19	that, we have had a real unstable production level. And
20	how you can say what we're doing now works and what we
21	did 20 years ago or for 20 years doesn't work, I'm
22	quite I don't quite understand. So thank you very
23	much.
24	MR. DECELLE: Well, my point there or my
25	explanation for that would be some of those other York Stenographic Services, Inc.

1	factors in terms of the structural market, consumer
2	choices and other related issues that go directly to the
3	volume of hops used.
4	MR. GASSELING: Okay. Then I guess you also
5	made the comment then that there's been substantial
6	changes in these past years with light beers and so
7	forth. So if we had a stable we've had different
8	situations in the past few years, but yet the production
9	has gone all over the board. Yet, the 20 years the
10	marketing order was in effect, we had increases in beer
11	production. We had changes in varieties. But we were
12	able to maintain a relatively stable supply. And this
13	whole marketing order has nothing to do with controlling
14	the supply itself. It has to do with controlling the
15	oversupply. And that's what this really, by your own
16	testimony, I think points to. So I appreciate it.
17	Thank you.
18	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: I didn't catch
19	your question on that.
20	MR. GASSELING: I guess it wasn't I guess
21	well, okay. I can phrase it as a question. Given that,
22	do you still contend that the last marketing order was a
23	complete failure?
24	MR. DECELLE: Well, I would answer that by
25	saying I believe that there are other were other
	York Stenographic Services, Inc.

1	economic forces in play during that period that
2	even in the subsequent periods that independent of
3	the marketing order that led to the success or the
4	difficulties that the industry faces.
5	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Any further
6	questions, Mr. Gasseling? No? Any other questions from
7	members of the Proponents Committee? All right.
8	Questions from others. Mr. Carswell.
9	MR. CARSWELL: Mr. DeCelle, looking at this
10	chart and the increases in purchases and fluctuations in
11	purchases after 1986, could those fluctuations, for
12	example, be based on increased demand for hops around
13	the world?
14	MR. DECELLE: I'm not well enough versed in
15	the international market to respond to that.
16	MR. CARSWELL: Could these increases just be
17	based on the fact that there's demand for these hops and
18	that's why they were produced?
19	MR. DECELLE: Well, they certainly could be.
20	I mean the beer market today and even going back 20
21	years is increasingly an international market, and I
22	think it's safe to say that there's all kinds of other
23	activity going on around the world that could lead to
24	fluctuations in good years and bad years from anybody in
25	the industry.

1	MR. CARSWELL: If you look on the chart, in
2	1990, the price the grower price average for 56
3	million pounds of hops, almost 57 million, was \$1.48.
4	Then if you look at 1999, 69 million plus pounds were
5	produced and the price was \$1.68. Then you look at
6	1992. 74 million pounds were produced and the price was
7	up to \$1.74. Would those numbers indicate to you a hop
8	glut where you have rising prices growers are receiving
9	for an ever-increasing amount of hops? Would that, to
10	you, indicate a hop glut?
11	MR. DECELLE: No. That would indicate, you
12	know, that there was still considerable demand at least
13	in some of that with the rising production period. And
14	I'm not sure what was the period again that you're
15	citing there, '91 to '94.
16	MR. CARSWELL: I'm sorry. '90 to '92.
17	MR. DECELLE: '90 to '92.
18	MR. CARSWELL: And onto '93, for example.
19	MR. DECELLE: I mean that appears to be a
20	pretty healthy economic situation there.
21	MR. CARSWELL: So this could be construed as a
22	fully proper response to market demand. Couldn't it?
23	MR. DECELLE: Certainly.
24	MR. CARSWELL: I wanted to go back to a point
25	on the quality of hops being affected that you had
	York Stenographic Services, Inc.

1	answered earlier. And I'd like to take you back to my
2	scenario that I posed to my hypothetical that I posed
3	to Mr. Carpenter earlier. I believe you were in the
4	room at the time.
5	MR. DECELLE: Yes.
6	MR. CARSWELL: Were you listening?
7	MR. DECELLE: Yes.
8	MR. CARSWELL: In that situation, I described
9	grower B as being someone who used to produced 100,000
10	pounds that had 10 percent alpha so he would have 10,000
11	pounds of alpha to that would be that would be
12	established as his base going into the hop market order
13	period. And then I gave the hypothetical of there being
14	a 50 percent cut in the saleable quantity of hops that
15	would be established by the hop administrative
16	committee. Thus, that grower B would only be able to
17	grow 50,000 pounds of hops. Presume he has a
18	relationship with
19	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Just a moment.
20	Only be able to sell?
21	MR. CARSWELL: I said grow, I believe, and I
22	should have said sell. He would only be able to sell
23	50,000 pounds of hops if there was a 50 percent cut in
24	the saleable quantity.
25	MR. DECELLE: Okay.
	York Stenographic Services, Inc.
	34 North George St., York, PA 17401 - (717) 854-0077

1	MR. CARSWELL: And so presume that he has a
2	relationship with a brewer where in previous years he's
3	bought 100,000 pounds of hops I'm sorry the
4	brewers bought 100,000 pounds of hops from this grower
5	and it's been done because the grower has a quality the
6	brewer requires and they have a good relationship and so
7	he's been buying the brewer has been buying these
8	hops from this grower at 100,000 pounds. If he is $$ if
9	he's cut to 50,000 and that's all he can grow without
10	acquiring base
11	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Or at least all
12	that he can sell.
13	MR. CARSWELL: All that he can sell. I'm
14	sorry. Thank you, Your Honor. I'll be careful. I
15	apologize. Could you see a disruption in the
16	relationship between that brewer and that grower because
17	the brewer would not be able to buy the hops that he's
18	been able to buy in the past?
19	MR. DECELLE: Certainly. That's the scenario
20	that I attempted to paint in response to one of the
21	questions. And actually, I was approaching it under the
22	thought with the thought that the brewer would do
23	everything possible not to sacrifice the quality. But I
24	suppose, in the alternative, if for whatever reason,
25	if the successful grower of the 100,000 pounds was not
	York Stenographic Services, Inc.

1	able to sell that quantity or acquire the base, then the
2	brewer might, in fact, have to substitute it for a
3	different crop
4	MR. CARSWELL: Well, he certainly
5	MR. DECELLE:and maintain productions.
6	MR. CARSWELL: It's true, isn't it, that he
7	certainly couldn't acquire it, the hops, from this
8	particular grower?
9	MR. DECELLE: Correct. And so whatever
10	standards, you know I know that the brewers would do
11	everything possible to maintain the quality standards
12	and I was answering the question under that presumption.
13	But it certainly could cause a disruption and I think
14	it's a plausible potential outcome of a marketing order.
15	MR. CARSWELL: Thank you.
16	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Thank you, Mr.
17	Carswell. Mr. Jekanowski, I've been referring to you as
18	mister. I know you're an economist. Do you have your
19	PHD?
20	DR. JEKANOWSKI: Yes.
21	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: I'm sorry. I
22	should have been calling
23	DR. JEKANOWSKI: Yes. I do.
24	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Thank you. I
25	should have been calling you Dr. Jekanowski.

DR. JEKANOWSKI: That's fine. I can't
write prescriptions.
ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Dr. Jekanowski,
you may cross-examine.
DR. JEKANOWSKI: Yeah. I was surprised
well, kind of surprised. Well, the point was made
before that there's 20 or 25 varieties of hops grown.
Is that correct?
MR. DECELLE: That's correct. From one of
the Proponents.
DR. JEKANOWSKI: Why are there so many
varieties of hops?
MR. DECELLE: Well, the there's many
scientific and other variables within the hop
different varieties of hops. And I would suggest you
ask the question in more detail to the folks who buy
them for the brewers. But they have different purposes
at different points in the brewing process and they are
all combined in varying amounts to produce a particular
taste profile in a beer. And that's especially
important for brewers that brew in more than one
facility. They want to maintain an adequate supply in
all of their facilities that produce a particular brand
for quality control.
DR. JEKANOWSKI: So all types of hops

ī	aten t necessarily used in the same way of for the same
2	types of beer.
3	MR. DECELLE: No. I've been at many brewers.
4	As we said before, they're not even they're processed
5	in different ways. So they use them in very different
6	ways.
7	DR. JEKANOWSKI: But is it your
8	understanding it is mine that doesn't the
9	marketing order consider alpha acid only as you know,
10	what makes a hop a hop is alpha acid.
11	MR. DECELLE: That's one of the components.
12	But I would defer to people the marketing order
13	covers the entire industry. Correct?
14	DR. JEKANOWSKI: Right.
15	MR. DECELLE: So it's not
16	DR. JEKANOWSKI: That's my understanding.
17	MR. DECELLE:unique to one particular
18	variety. That's not what you were saying. You were
19	just talking about alpha acid as one of the basic
20	components of hops.
21	DR. JEKANOWSKI: Well, I just it occurs
22	to me that the marketing order is only interested the
23	way I understand it, it's only interested in alpha acid.
24	But what you're telling me right now is that there's in
25	fact many different quality characteristics or flavor
	York Stenographic Services, Inc.

1	characteristics of hops that are also important aside
2	from alpha acid. Is that right?
3	MR. DECELLE: Correct.
4	DR. JEKANOWSKI: The point was made, too,
5	that there's for some varieties, there's only maybe
6	one grower for particular varieties. Is that correct?
7	Do you agree with that?
8	MR. DECELLE: That's what I've been told.
9	DR. JEKANOWSKI: Okay. So that implies
10	that that grower has built up a relationship with that
11	particular brewer with that particular need for that
12	specific minor variety of hops. Would that be your
13	characterization?
14	MR. DECELLE: I don't know whether it would
15	be a minor variety.
16	DR. JEKANOWSKI: Well
17	MR. DECELLE: If it was something they used
18	in a major brand, you know
19	DR. JEKANOWSKI: Sure.
20	MR. DECELLE:it could be several
21	DR. JEKANOWSKI: But assuming there's
22	only
23	MR. DECELLE:brewers producing one form
24	of hops and that might be their only crop. But given
25	DR. JEKANOWSKI: Okay.

l	MR. DECELLE:the make up of the market,
2	that wouldn't surprise me.
3	DR. JEKANOWSKI: But so if there's some
4	varieties that are only grown by one producer, I mean
5	that implies that that producer is responding to the
6	needs of that particular brewer or that particular
7	market segment or you know whatever. Basically that
8	market that hop variety is probably responding to
9	market needs.
10	MR. DECELLE: Correct.
11	DR. JEKANOWSKI: Correct? So then if the
12	Hop Marketing Order only considers alpha acid, what
13	happens to that brewer or to that hop grower who's
14	subject to a saleable on that variety of hops that's
15	fulfilling some particular market need?
16	MR. DECELLE: I'm not sure I understand your
17	focus on the alpha acid.
18	DR. JEKANOWSKI: Well, it's my
19	understanding that the marketing order treats all hops
20	the same based on the alpha acid composition. Is that
21	your understanding?
22	MR. DECELLE: I'm not sure I can answer that.
23	I think if it treats that hops as one single commodity
24	are you trying to get at the idea whether it treats
25	individual varieties or as opposed to the entire hops
	York Stenographic Services, Inc.

1	production?
2	DR. JEKANOWSKI: Well, that's exactly what
3	I'm trying to get at that
4	MR. DECELLE: Okay.
5	DR. JEKANOWSKI:essentially the
6	marketing order is interested in one characteristic of
7	hops, alpha acid.
8	MR. DECELLE: Okay.
9	DR. JEKANOWSKI: Do you agree with that?
10	MR. DECELLE: Well, no, because if that were
11	the only characteristic, then the why have the other
12	varieties, if you will?
13	DR. JEKANOWSKI: That's my question. I
14	agree. I don't understand it either.
15	MR. DECELLE: Okay. All right.
16	DR. JEKANOWSKI: I just wanted to see if
17	anybody understood.
18	MR. DECELLE: No. I'm sorry. I didn't mean
19	to be dense.
20	DR. JEKANOWSKI: No. Nothing further.
21	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Thank you, Dr.
22	Jekanowski. Any other cross-examination of Mr. DeCelle?
23	All right. There being none, Mr. DeCelle, is there any
24	follow-up you'd like to give us now just to clarify
25	anything that came out on cross-examination?
	York Stenographic Services, Inc.

1	MR. DECELLE: No, Your Honor.
2	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: All right.
3	Let's deal with the exhibits. Is there any objection to
4	the admission into evidence of Exhibit 16, which is the
5	chart regarding per capita beer consumption 1977 through
6	2001? There being none, Exhibit 16 oh, sorry. Mr.
7	Monahan.
8	MR. MONAHAN: I just I have a question. I
9	don't think I have an objection, but I just want to make
10	sure what the exhibit is.
11	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: All right.
12	MR. MONAHAN: Do I understand that this
13	refers to per capita beer consumption by Americans of
14	beer made in America?
15	MR. DECELLE: No. That is the overall
16	market. So that's all beer.
17	MR. MONAHAN: All beer
18	MR. DECELLE: That would include the import
19	sector as well, which is about 10 percent of the total.
20	MR. MONAHAN: Okay. So all beer consumed by
21	Americans?
22	MR. DECELLE: Correct.
23	MR. MONAHAN: Thank you. No objection, Your
24	Honor.
25	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: All right.
	York Stenographic Services, Inc.

1	Exhibit 16 is hereby admitted into evidence. Exhibit 17
2	is the U.S. Domestic Brewer Output. The chart shows
3	years 1980 through 2002. Is there any objection or any
4	voir dire questions of the witness?
5	MS. DESKINS: I have one, Your Honor.
6	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Ms. Deskins.
7	MS. DESKINS: What does TTB stand for?
8	MR. DECELLE: TTB is an acronym for the
9	Alcohol and Tobacco Tax and Trade Bureau, which is a
10	sub-agency of the Treasury Department responsible for
11	regulating the industry. The name changed with the
12	Department of Homeland Security Act. Used to be called
13	Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms.
14	MS. DESKINS: Okay. Thank you.
15	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: And thank you
16	for that question. Any other yes. Mr. Monahan.
17	MR. MONAHAN: Yes. Does this Exhibit is
18	it 18, Your Honor? I'm sorry.
19	MR. DECELLE: It is 17.
20	MR. MONAHAN: 17. Does Exhibit 17 include
21	export sales?
22	MR. DECELLE: I am not positive, but I do not
23	believe. This is so called tax paid withdraws, which
24	are the domestic brewers output for sale in the United
25	States.

York Stenographic Services, Inc. 34 North George St., York, PA 17401 - (717) 854-0077

1	MR. MONAHAN:	Okay.
2	MR. DECELLE:	So I do not believe it does
3	include exports.	
4	MR. MONAHAN:	But you're not certain?
5	MR. DECELLE:	No.
6	MR. MONAHAN:	Okay. Thank you, Your Honor.
7	ADMINISTRATIVE	LAW JUDGE: Any other
8	questions? Then yes,	Dr. Hinman.
9	DR. HINMAN:	Just one more question.
10	ADMINISTRATIVE	LAW JUDGE: Dr. Hinman, I
11	don't think your mike is	on.
12	DR. HINMAN:	Mr. DeCelle, could you refer
13	back to the USDA data tab	ole, data compilation on page 7
14	I'm sorry page 15,	Table 7? In the second to the
15	last column there, domest	ic usage of U.S. hops. And
16	we've already discussed t	the difficulty of computing this
17	figure passed 1996. Do y	ou have any data that would
18	shed light, that would be	e able to extend that figure,
19	domestic usage of U.S. ho	ops passed this date in 1996?
20	MR. DECELLE:	We don't produce that data, but
21	I believe that the Treasu	ary Department would have data.
22	I don't know how they col	llect it. There could be a lot
23	of variations. But brewe	ers are required by law to
24	submit a monthly or quart	erly report, depending on their
25	size, that includes agric	cultural usage. And that
		ographic Services, Inc.
	34 North George St. N	York PA 17401 - (717) 854-0077

1	information is collected and published. But we've had
2	some problem with their data so I'm not sure and
3	making apples to apples comparisons, I'm sure it's
4	fairly accurate as to what it purports to be but it's
5	not always easy because of fiscal years and other things
6	to make clean comparisons. Maybe you've run into that
7	problem.
8	DR. HINMAN: Thank you.
9	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: You're welcome,
10	Dr. Hinman. Is there any objection to the admission
11	into evidence of Exhibit 17? There being none, Exhibit
12	17 is hereby admitted into evidence. Now I have need
13	giving a number to the written statement that Mr.
14	DeCelle has brought. I believe I said it would be 18.
15	All right. So when you give that to me I will mark that
16	as Exhibit 18. And Mr. DeCelle, do you have any
17	questions of those people who have asked you to supply
18	information with regard to what it is they want?
19	MR. DECELLE: No. I think I have accurate
20	notes of what's been asked for or requested. I would
21	the other potential exhibit, which I believe I can
22	obtain for you, would be the Tax and Trade Bureau or
23	Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms recommendation on how much
24	hops to use the ratio of hops in a given volume of
25	beer. I may be able to provide that before I leave.
	York Stenographic Services, Inc.
	24 North George St., Vork. PA 17401 - (717) 854-0077

1	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Good. Thank
2	you. All right. Feel free at any time that you have
3	more information for us just to step in the door and
4	we'll
5	MR. DECELLE: Certainly.
6	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE:stop what
7	we're doing to take that.
8	MR. DECELLE: I'll try to do that quickly.
9	Thank you.
10	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: All right. Very
11	good.
12	MR. DECELLE: Thank you.
13	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: All right. You
14	may step down, Mr. DeCelle. Thank you. Mr. Monahan,
15	are you prepared now to go forward with your next
16	witness or would you like a brief break? Court reporter
17	would. Let's take 15 minutes. Please be back ready to
18	go at 3:20.
19	***
20	[Off the record.]
21	[On the record.]
22	* * *
23	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: We're back on
24	record at 3:24 p.m. The court reporter needs
25	clarification of some spellings, particularly of names
	York Stenographic Services, Inc.

1	that were used. Mr. Moody, several of them are people
2	that you identified when you were asking questions about
3	seven different companies that may have marketed hops.
4	MR. MOODY: Your Honor, if it's okay we'll
5	do it off record at the next break so as not to waste
6	your time.
7	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Yes. That's
8	what I'd like for you to do. I think you will probably
9	be able to provide most of the spellings the court
10	reporter has and if there are any left over we'll deal
11	with those at a later time. All right. Mr. Monahan,
12	what would you like to do next?
13	MR. MONAHAN: Your Honor, I note with just a
14	hint of dismay that we are now through the first of our
15	15 witnesses. Before we proceed on to witness #2, I
16	would just like to bring up one housekeeping matter.
17	And that is we learned from Mr. DeCelle today that there
18	are members of the Beer Institute who intend to testify
19	at these hearings. We learned from Mr. Moody that there
20	are indeed growers in opposition to the Hop Marketing
21	Order who intend to testify. The Proponents Committee
22	did provide the courtesy of making a list of the persons
23	who will testify in support and the order in which
24	they'll appear. I did note during the cross-examination
25	of Mr. DeCelle that there were a number of I'll
	York Stenographic Services, Inc.

1	euphemistically phrase it as scattered cross-examination
2	questions from the Proponents Committee. And I think if
3	we have a list or some idea of who was going to be
4	testifying in opposition to the proposal either on
5	behalf of Mr. DeCelle's members or from the Opposition I
6	think it would help the Proponents streamline
7	questioning and would help us speed through this
8	process, Your Honor.
9	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: All right. I
10	think it's sometimes difficult for people testifying
11	against a proposition to identify who all will be
12	involved. So without considering it a limitation in any
13	way on the witnesses that will be called, to the extent
14	you know witnesses, I do with you would share that
15	information with one another. And Mr. DeCelle, you're
16	in the room now. Is that correct?
17	MR. DECELLE: Yes, Your Honor.
18	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: All right. Do
19	you know of particular members of your organization who
20	will be testifying that you could identify for us?
21	MR. DECELLE: Is it okay to respond from
22	here?
23	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: It is but that
24	may not be on.
25	MR. DECELLE: Okay. I'm sorry. I am aware
	York Stenographic Services, Inc.
	34 North George St., York, PA 17401 - (717) 854-0077

1	of a couple of company representatives that are
2	interested in testifying. I can't tell you exactly
3	when, however. I know there's one gentleman from Coors
4	Brewing Company. And I don't know, Mr. Moody or Mr.
5	Carswell can speak for Anheiser-Busch.
6	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: All right. Do
7	you know the name of the gentleman from Coors?
8	MR. DECELLE: No. I do not, Your Honor.
9	MR. DECELLE: All right. All right. So do
10	you have any other specifics that you could supply at
11	this time with regard to your members?
12	MR. DECELLE: No. I do not. I do have the
13	exhibits
14	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Excellent.
15	MR. DECELLE:that were available. I have
16	my written statement plus the Tax and Trade Bureau
17	guidance on proportions of hops and other products to be
18	used in beer and other malt beverages.
19	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: All right. And
20	do you have only one copy of each?
21	MR. DECELLE: No. I just got copies made so
22	I have four of each.
23	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Excellent. All
24	right. If you would approach me with those at this
25	time. I'm marking your statement as Exhibit 18. Would
	York Stenographic Services, Inc.

1	you prease hand this one to the court reporter as the
2	record copy? With regard to the other three, would you
3	give one to Mr. Monahan, one to Ms. Deskins and one to
4	Mr. Moody? Those of you that have those copies I'd ask
5	that you'd share them with the people that are sitting
6	in your vicinity. And what is your other document?
7	MR. DECELLE: The other document
8	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: I'm sorry. I
9	turned that off.
.0	MR. DECELLE: All right. The other document
1	is entitled "Minimum Requirements for Malt Beverage
12	(Beer) Products." It's the informal guidance that the
13	Tax and Trade Bureau, formerly the ATF and prior to that
14	Alcohol and Tax Alcohol and Tobacco Tax Division has
15	used since 1970 to classify a malt beverage and it
16	includes a proportion of hops that should be used per
i 7	100 barrels of beer. And I believe it's responsive to
18	one of the questions from the Department of Agriculture
19	staff.
20	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: All right. I'd
21	like to mark that as Exhibit 19. And from what document
22	does this come?
23	MR. DECELLE: There's a citation on it,
24	publication that the Alcohol and Tobacco or ATF used
25	to do periodically called Compliance Matters, which was
	York Stenographic Services, Inc.

1	various little pieces of federal guidance with specific
2	application at different parts of the alcohol beverage
3	industry, kind of a very technical newsletter type
4	document, if you will.
5	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: All right.
6	Thank you. Would you give the one that I have marked to
7	the court reporter as the official copy and distribute
8	the other three to Ms. Deskins, Mr. Monahan and Mr.
9	Moody? Mr. DeCelle, thank you very much. Is there
10	anything further before you depart?
11	MR. DECELLE: No, Your Honor. Thank you very
12	much.
13	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Thank you. Mr.
14	Moody, with regard to the question that was asked by Mr.
15	Monahan, are you able to provide any identification of
16	witnesses you intend on calling?
17	MR. MOODY: Yes, Your Honor. We'll have a
18	typed list in the morning for as many of the con growers
19	that we know are coming as we can assemble.
20	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Thank you.
21	MR. MOODY: Thank you.
22	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: All right. Mr.
23	Monahan, you may proceed.
24	MR. CARSWELL: Excuse me, Your Honor.
25	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Yes.
	York Stenographic Services, Inc.

1	MR. CARSWELL: I just wanted to add that we
2	have Don Kloth.
3	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Oh, I'm sorry,
4	Mr. Carswell.
5	MR. CARSWELL: That's okay.
6	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Thank you.
7	Don
8	MR. CARSWELL: Kloth. It's K-l-o-t-h, but the
9	h is silent. And he's the head of corporate purchasing
10	at Anheiser-Busch and he plans to be here Friday to
11	testify. And I also happen to know that a couple of
12	other brewer representatives are planning to come. One
13	is Kurt Widmer from Widmer Brewing, planning to be here
14	on Friday.
15	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: And how is his
16	name spelled if you know?
17	MR. CARSWELL: W-i-d-m-e-r.
18	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: All right.
19	MR. CARSWELL: His name is K-u-r-t I believe.
20	And then next week in Yakima we plan Mr. Paul Shipman
21	plans to be there. And he is the CEO, I believe, of
22	Redhook. And Paul Shipman is S-h-i-p-m-a-n.
23	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: And that is
24	Redhook.
25	MR. CARSWELL: Yes, ma'am. One word. Redhook
	York Stenographic Services Inc

1	Brewing Company.
2	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Thank you. Are
3	there any other witnesses that are known at this time
4	who would be testifying against the proposals?
5	DR. JEKANOWSKI: I will be testifying
6	against the proposal, Your Honor.
7	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: All right.
8	Thank you, Dr. Jekanowski. All right. That's a start
9	at any rate. Mr. Monahan.
10	MR. MONAHAN: Thank you, Your Honor.
11	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: You're welcome.
12	You may proceed.
13	MR. MONAHAN: Your Honor, the Proponents
14	Committee would call Mr. Michael Smith. And Your Honor,
15	Mr. Smith is going to be presenting a Power Point
16	presentation, which requires him to fiddle with the
17	computer that is seated on the table. And we would ask
18	the Court's permission to allow him to testify from his
19	seat.
20	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: He may.
21	MR. MONAHAN: And the first question I'd ask
22	Mr. Smith is what are those things we're looking at up
23	there?
24	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Now, does he
25	have a microphone? I'd like you to keep one, Mr.
	York Stenographic Services, Inc.

1	monanan. Do you think are there two that would
2	reach?
3	MR. MONAHAN: I'll sit at the other table,
4	Your Honor.
5	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: That would be
6	great. Thank you.
7	MR. SMITH: We think so too.
8	MS. DESKINS: Judge Clifton, he needs to be
9	sworn in before he starts.
10	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Thank you. I
11	appreciate that. Whenever my routine is disrupted I
12	forget these little details. Mr. Smith would you state
13	your full name and spell it for us?
14	MR. SMITH: Michael M. Smith. Do you still
15	want me to spell it?
16	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: No. The middle
17	initial is M as in Michael also.
18	MR. SMITH: No. Marion
19	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Marion. Okay.
20	Now I need you to spell Marion.
21	MR. SMITH: $M-a-r-i-o-n$.
22	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: All right.
23	Thank you.
24	***
25	[Witness sworn]
	York Stenographic Services, Inc.
	34 North George St., York, PA 17401 - (717) 854-0077

1	***
2	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Mr. Monahan, you
3	may ask your question again please.
4	MR. MONAHAN: I'm afraid I was being
5	facetious, Your Honor. I asked him to identify the
6	things we're looking up at the screen.
7	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Oh, all right.
8	You may go forward, Mr. Smith.
9	MR. SMITH: Well, one of the, if not the
10	most important question that's before this group of
11	growers and Department today is should U.S. growers
12	adopt a federal marketing order for hops. For my
13	portion of the testimony and the evidence, I guess, that
14	I'm going to deliver today will be primarily in fact,
15	completely revolve around these varieties starting
16	here with Chelan/Tillicum, Warrior, Millennium, CTZ,
17	Chinook, Galena and Nugget. Those varieties comprise 75
18	percent of the total production from the United States
19	in crop year 2002. And the reason that I'm going to do
20	that is that these varieties here are domestically-grown
21	varieties that are used primarily in domestic markets,
22	whereas these varieties in fact the majority of those
23	varieties are exported to world brewers. So for
24	MS. DESKINS: Judge Clifton, I hate to
25	interrupt, but in terms of the record, when you point
	York Stenographic Services, Inc.
	34 North George St., York, PA 17401 - (717) 854-0077

1	things out it's not going to appear on the record what
2	you're speaking about. So when you say these
3	varieties
4	MR. SMITH: Okay.
5	MS. DESKINS:that's not going to appear
6	on the record so keep that in mind that whatever you say
7	identify it because on the record it's just going it
8	won't be clear what you're talking about.
9	MR. SMITH: I understand. I'm not sure
10	I'll be able to do it, but I understand.
11	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Mr. Smith, if
12	right now, would you show me beginning with the
13	Willamette over on the right hand side, which of the
14	varieties are used primarily for domestic use.
15	MR. SMITH: Willamette, Mt. Hood, Perle
16	Cascade, and then other aroma. This actually comprises
17	about 20 different varieties, Your Honor, in the other
18	aroma category.
19	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: All right. And
20	again, if you would name for me, beginning with the
21	Chelan/Tillicum.
22	MR. SMITH: Yes. Chelan/Tillicum. That's
23	actually two different varieties but they're very
24	similar in nature. Those varieties are in excess of 10
25	percent alpha acid. Warrior/Millennium are actually two
	York Stenographic Services, Inc.
	34 North George St., York, PA 17401 - (717) 854-0077

1	separate varieties of similar nature, released about a
2	similar time, in excess of 10 percent alpha. CTZ is
3	actually a composition of three different names but
4	essentially the same variety. And the CTZ stands for
5	Columbus, Tomahawk and Zeus. Chinook, Galena and
6	Nugget, and all of these varieties have between 12 and
7	20 percent alpha acids on an annual basis.
8	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Now, were the
9	varieties beginning at the time with the Chelan/Tillicum
10	and going clear around to Nugget all used primarily for
11	export?
12	MR. SMITH: The bulk of those are used for
13	export. That's true.
14	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: All right.
15	Thank you.
16	MR. SMITH: I also want to preface my
17	comments so that USDA understands and certainly I'm sure
18	the audience understands that I don't consider myself to
19	be an expert in statistics. I don't consider myself to
20	be expert in brewing. But I do consider myself to be a
21	student of the hop market and for the last 22, 23 years
22	I've taken a personal interest in the hop market in
23	statistics and tracking prices and so forth. And that's
24	what I offer today. Reasons for a Hop Marketing Order,
25	I think there are three primary reasons. It could be
	York Stenographic Services, Inc.

	argued that there's quite a few more. One, that the
2	U.S. production of those varieties mentioned earlier
3	does have an impact on world prices, that the demand for
1	hops is inelastic in nature, and that the hop market has
5	developed into a situation where we really have lack of
5	what I would term a competitive market. And I'll
7	address each one of those separately. First, looking at
8	the impact that U.S. hops have on world prices for alpha
9	acid, a little bit of historical perspective I think is
0	in order. We can this is and most of these graphs
1	will depict about a 10-year period in time, but in 1994
2	in the United States you can see that the alpha acid
3	production from that class of varieties was concentrated
4	into three varieties. The access on the left-hand side
5	of the chart is listed in kilograms of alpha that were
6	produced at the farm level. And those three varieties
7	were Nugget, Galena and Chinook. Beginning in about
8	1996, this class of varieties, CTZ, was released into
9	the market. And you can see that since 1996 until 2001
0	there was a significant increase in production in that
1.1	class of varieties. That class of varieties produces
.2	significantly more alpha and we'll see that later in the
2.3	presentation and those other varieties. And thus,
24	there's some economic benefits certainly to brewers for
25	growers to grow those varieties. And then there's been
	York Stenographic Services, Inc.

1	a couple of new varieties that have kind of appeared in
2	the last few years. Millennium and Warrior are both
3	propriety varieties that were released from private
4	breeding programs. If we looked at that on a percentage
5	basis of alpha acids produced for this crop okay, and
6	these are estimates based on information that I have
7	obtained from growers and from our own farm and so forth
8	and they'll be finalized or have final figures in
9	January you can see 43 percent of that alpha acid is
10	produced by the group of varieties, CTZ. Millennium
11	should produce about 12 percent of the alpha. Warrior
12	about nine percent. Chelan and Tillicum two percent.
13	Nugget 14 percent. Galena 17 percent. And Chinook
14	three percent. This is a graph because as we move into
15	the statistical or the charts that I'm going to show
16	today we'll also be comparing U.S. production of alpha
17	acids with alpha acids produced with the other primary
18	growing region that we compete with primarily and that's
19	in Germany. We can see the beginning of this time cycle
20	in 1993 that the three varieties that were most heavily
21	planted in the world, in fact, were use varieties on an
22	acreage basis. We had Chinook, Nugget and Galena. The
23	fourth most popular variety or most planted variety I
24	should use that term, I guess was German Magnum.
25	Okay. And German Magnum is a high-alpha variety as
	York Stenographic Services, Inc.

1	well, alpha acids typically in the 13 to 15 percent
2	area. And what we notice as we look at the graph is the
3	primary varieties, the three most popular varieties 11
4	years ago certainly are not the most popular varieties
5	today. We see that Magnum has had a terrific increase
6	in productive area over the last 11 years.
7	MR. MOODY: Excuse me, Mr. Smith. Your
8	Honor, if I may ask a question.
9	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Yes, Mr. Moody.
10	MR. MOODY: Thanks. Brendan this morning
11	mentioned that the slides would be used just to put text
12	of the marketing order sections up on the screen, which
13	we all have printed copies of, which is fine. And this
14	is a pretty fascinating presentation, but you know, I
15	well, I can't see anything from here. But it would help
16	us to prepare and understand for the presentation to
17	have copies of these slides and graphs. I know it would
18	help the record. This is not helpful to the record
19	because it's on the screen but it's not going on the
20	record as it is. So if we could get copies of these
21	slides
22	MR. MONAHAN: That was what we
23	MR. MOODY:and just go through them.
24	MR. MONAHAN: Sorry, Jim. That's what we
25	reserved for Exhibit 8.
	York Stenographic Services, Inc.

York Stenographic Services, Inc. 34 North George St., York, PA 17401 - (717) 854-0077

1	MR. MOODY: This is Exhibit 8 you're doing?
2	MR. MONAHAN: Exhibit 8 will be the sum total
3	of the slide presentation by Mr. Smith.
4	MR. MOODY: That's these here?
5	MR. MONAHAN: Yes.
6	MR. MOODY: Okay.
7	MR. CARSWELL: For purposes of cross-
8	examination, can we you know I'd like to have a set
9	of these so I can refer back to them. Can we get a copy
10	now?
11	MR. SMITH: I'm not sure how we would do
12	that.
13	MR. MONAHAN: Got a printer?
14	MR. SMITH: But we could easily if you
15	wanted to make notations, we could easily back up to
16	these slides and put them up for you to ask questions.
17	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: My biggest
18	concern is that Mr. Moody be able to see what I'm
19	seeing, which is not possible without his having
20	something close to his eye. I'm wondering would it be
21	possible for us to change the order of the Proponents
22	Committees presentations so that the reproduction of
23	these slides would be available during your testimony,
24	Mr. Smith. Let me ask Mr. Monahan that question.
25	MR. MONAHAN: Certainly we're flexible as to
	York Stenographic Services, Inc.
	34 North George St., York, PA 17401 - (717) 854-0077

```
that, Your Honor. The historical and statistical
1
2
       information presented by Mr. Smith does really provide
       the foundation for the order itself and I think when we
3
       get into the nuts and bolts of verbiage, it's going to
       make a lot more sense with the background of Mr. Smith's
5
       presentation. So I guess it can be done but it really
       will be taking it out of order.
7
                  MS. DESKINS:
                                 Judge Clifton, I have a
8
       suggestion. Is it possible, if it's okay with the
9
       Proponents, if Mr. Moody sat next to Mr. Smith and he
10
       could look at the screen on the computer?
11
                  MR. MONAHAN: Do you have any problem with
12
13
        that, Jim?
                                 Well, that doesn't work.
                  MR. MOODY:
14
        can't have it here.
15
                  MR. MONAHAN:
                                  Okay.
16
                  MR. MOODY:
                                 You guys have not one single
17
        printed copy we could just run and Xerox real quick?
18
                  MR. SMITH:
                                  I didn't listen closely enough
19
        to Mr. -- well, to Brendan, because when he told me to
20
        print it out, I thought I could do that afterwards, that
21
        we could introduce that testimony afterwards and so I
22
        don't have a printed copy.
23
                  MR. MONAHAN: Your Honor, do you mind if we
24
        just take a five-minute break. I'll see if perhaps
25
                          York Stenographic Services, Inc.
```

```
there is set up at the hotel that we can print this
1
2
       right now.
                 MR. SMITH:
                                 We could probably go in the
3
       business office and print off at least one copy right
4
5
       away.
                 ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE:
                                                 That would be
7
       great.
8
                 MR. MONAHAN: We'll make the effort, Your
9
       Honor.
                  ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE:
10
                                                 All right.
11
       Good.
                  MR. MOODY:
                                 Thank you very much.
12
                  ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE:
                                                Let's -- I know
13
        it's going to take more than five minutes. So let's --
14
        everybody, you've got 15 minutes to mill around.
15
                                   ***
16
17
        [Off the record.]
18
        [On the record.]
                                   * * *
19
                  ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE:
                                                 We're back on
20
        record at 4:17. Thank you so much for making that copy.
21
        I realize it delayed things just a bit but I appreciate
22
        it very much. I am charging that time against
23
24
        Proponents though. Mr. Monahan, are you prepared to
25
        resume?
```

York Stenographic Services, Inc. 34 North George St., York, PA 17401 - (717) 854-0077

1	MR. MONAHAN: Yes, we are, Your Honor. Thank
2	you.
3	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: All right.
4	You're welcome. Mr. Smith, you may proceed.
5	MR. SMITH: Okay, Your Honor. Thank you.
6	I'm trying to remember where I was. I was talking about
7	the acreage change or the acreage distribution, so to
8	speak, over the last 11 years. And I was I think I
9	was commenting on the tremendous increase in acreage of
10	the German hop variety Magnum. And at this point, the
11	Magnum, in 2003, was by far the had the largest
12	planting in the world in this class of varieties. We
13	can see that CTZ group of varieties was also increasing
14	at a rapid rate until the year 2001 when it increased to
15	over 3000 areas. But over the last couple of years with
16	market conditions, the set aside program that was
17	referred to be Mr. Carpenter was in 2002, some CTZ were
18	laid idle at that point. And then market conditions for
19	2003 dictated that there was a further drop in acreage.
20	Looking at another class of varieties, because it gives
21	an indication of a significant change for the German hop
22	industry, but there's to other bittering varieties that
23	were primarily used before the advent or invention of
24	high-alpha varieties. Those didn't actually hit the
25	scene the hop industry until the early '90's
	York Stenographic Services, Inc.
	34 North George St., York, PA 17401 - (717) 854-0077

1	excuse me early '80's. But the Germans didn't have
2	access to any high alpha varieties. As you recall, from
3	an earlier graph, the Magnum was planted on a very low
4	scale in 1993 and was just getting going. But Northern
5	Brewer and Cluster, which are varieties that typically
6	would have between seven to eight percent for the
7	cluster and for Northern Brewer maybe as high as nine to
8	10 percent but generally more around eight, were
9	providing a significant amount of bittering in the
10	overall world market, but since the peak in 1996 have
11	fallen to less than 100,000 kilos of alpha for this
12	year. This graph is a graph of U.S. high-alpha hop
13	production in kilograms of alpha at the farm level. And
14	it's a compilation of all the varieties in those
15	classes. And so we can see in '93 and '94 something
16	over 2 million kilos of alpha up to about 2.5 million
17	kilos of alpha. And then in 1998 was the first year
18	that the United States had been affected by powdery
19	mildew, which is a devastating disease and in particular
20	devastated one variety, virtually wiping it out. And
21	you can see that we had a very low production relatively
22	speaking in 1998. We peaked our alpha production in the
23	year 2001 and the alpha production has declined
24	significantly over the last two years, this decline
25	being primarily due to reduction in acreage, not
	York Stenographic Services, Inc.
	34 North George St., York, PA 17401 - (717) 854-0077

1	reduction in yields. Looking at the German high-alpha
2	acreage or high-alpha production excuse me these
3	are varieties that are also in that 10 percent alpha
4	category or greater. And you can see that in 1993 the
5	Germans produced very little of these. The variety,
6	German Magnum, was just had just been released in a
7	couple of years earlier than this and was gaining
8	popularity but fairly slowly at first and then fairly
9	rapidly. You'll notice the 2003 estimate is
10	significantly lower than the 2002 production. This is
11	due to and maybe it's been referred to earlier in
12	testimony or in the discussions but the German crop
13	basically was a failure this year, as you can see.
14	Terrifically high temperatures, no moisture and resulted
15	in low production and very low alpha acid levels for
16	this year. And so from the level of last year's
17	production of something over 1.6 million kilos of alpha
18	at the farm level, this year, that production is
19	probably going to end up in the 800,000 to 900,000 kilo
20	alpha. When we put those and again, those varieties
21	compete directly in the market place all of those
22	varieties, both of the U.S. and the German alpha
23	varieties, compete directly with each other in
24	international markets primarily. So what I've done here
25	is I've put the German alpha combined the German
	York Stenographic Services, Inc.

1	alpha production from those varieties in the same class
2	with the U.S. alpha production to get a total alpha
3	production for the two major growing regions. And then
4	it even gets a little more interesting because then we
5	can begin to add bitter hop alpha, which would be alpha
6	from varieties that were producing somewhere between
7	seven and 10 percent alpha but were not really
8	considered to be aroma varieties; were really considered
9	to be bitter hop varieties. And those were primarily
10	we looked at them earlier Northern Brewer from
11	Germany, Cluster from the U.S. and then the bulk of the
12	Chinese production is also in that bitter hop category.
13	But again, just to give an idea of what the overall
14	bitter hop alpha production has been over this period of
15	ten years. Before I go to this graph I want to go back.
16	One of the the premise or the argument that I was
17	putting forth here is that, in fact, the U.S. alpha
18	production from this class of varieties does, in fact,
19	have an impact on world prices. And what you can see as
20	you go back and let's try that again as you go
21	back and we look at this graph, which includes all the
22	bitter hop varieties, the Chinese production and we look
23	at then we go back on graph and we look at the German
24	and U.S. together and then we look at the U.S. by
25	itself. What we see is that those graphs look typically
	York Stenographic Services, Inc.

the same, that they're very similar. And so it gives us an indication that the U.S. production of alpha has a significant impact, obviously, on the overall alpha production in the world and subsequently -- and I'll show in the next graph -- has an impact on the pricing of world alpha. So let's run back down. Here we go. This is a graph that I put together and it didn't reproduce very well under Power Point, but it's a graph that I put together to try to give me an indication of what the demand for U.S. high alpha was. And absent having any good data to go to as far as brewer usage worldwide, what we do have good figures on is the actual amount of alpha that was produced at the farms. We know The other thing that we know or at least that we can get some indications is what pricing does. what I was looking for when putting this graph together was the price action as it related to production. in doing so -- and this is a very rudimentary analysis -- but it gave me some feel for what the market for U.S. alpha was. And so you can see in the bars, we have the total amount of alpha that was produced at the farm in that class of varieties. We have a price indication on the yellow chart here. And what I've done to acquire that data is looked at prices -- FOB prices to brewers four to six months after the crop. The reason I chose York Stenographic Services, Inc.

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

i	that is because right after the harvest a lot of times
2	there will be some price fluctuations in the market
3	place that may not have a lot to do with delivery of
4	alpha to brewers but rather some balancing of positions
5	by dealers or so forth. But four to six months after
6	the harvest, the markets generally settle down. Those
7	people that have alpha in the inventory or for sale want
8	to sell it. Those people who need alpha are in the
9	market to buy it. And so I thought that was a better
10	indication of how the price reacted to the previous
11	years crop. And what we can see is that we started out
12	with about a \$48 per kilogram alpha average
13	approximately six months following the 1994 harvest.
14	Okay. The 1994 harvest in Germany was a fairly poor
15	harvest in general. It was hot weather. They had low
16	alpha. So there was some opportunities that existed for
17	U.S. hops at that point as well as the fact, if you
18	remember from a previous graph, that in 1994 the Germans
19	really didn't produce a significant quantity of alpha in
20	this class of varieties. It was less than 300,000 kilos
21	of alpha. So the American farmer had a tremendous
22	advantage over the Germans at this particular time in
23	the market place. And this \$48 figure was a good price
24	for U.S. growers but a price that the German farmers
25	really couldn't compete with. And we, in fact, in 1994,
	York Stenographic Services, Inc.

1	American farmers were delivering American alpha to
2	German brewers to be used in their own country, which
3	was kind of an interesting scenario; one that we haven't
4	seen in the last few years. So we can see in 1995, the
5	U.S. produced about 2.8 million kilos of alpha and we
6	saw a slight reduction in average price from \$48 to \$43.
7	In 1996, the U.S. produced 2.9 million kilos of alpha,
8	almost 3 million kilos of alpha from this class of
9	varieties. We saw a further erosion in price. In 1997,
10	even though the overall production in alpha had dropped
11	to just under 2.8 million kilos of alpha we saw an
12	erosion in price further, which indicates that even when
13	we have a large crop from the year prior if that entire
14	crop is not moved into the market it still begins to
15	have a depressing effect on world prices. In 1998, we
16	talked about it earlier, powdery mildew hit. The U.S.
17	had a very poor production of alpha acids. And
18	correspondingly, a few months later we saw an increase
19	in prices. 1999 went to 2.8 million kilos of alpha but
20	the deficit that was created from 1998 was still
21	apparent in the market place and we saw an improvement
22	in pricing back to the 40 approximately the \$42
23	level. In 2000 was really the beginning we've heard
24	it talked to before chronic oversupply or whatever,
25	but certainly it was the beginning of the oversupply
	York Stenographic Services, Inc.
	34 North George St., York, PA 17401 - (717) 854-0077

1	situation that we've been suffering under the last few
2	years. The U.S. produced 3.2 million kilos of alpha
3	that year, far exceeding anything that we had produced
4	in prior years. And after being in a somewhat balanced
5	situation, we saw an erosion in prices a few months
6	after the harvest. 2001, again if you remember the
7	graph of the varieties, the CTZ group of varieties was
8	being planted on a wider and wider scale through this
9	period of time. And that was the bulk of the increase
10	in production was coming out of those varieties. In
11	2001, we produced actually we produced over 3.5
12	million kilos of alpha. Fortunately, I guess for the
13	industry, unfortunately maybe for some individuals,
14	there was a couple of warehouse fires that destroyed
15	it's been estimated about 90,000 kilos of alpha. So
16	that alpha never actually was forced on the market
17	place. But six months following the harvest, we saw a
18	further erosion in price. And then last year, even
19	though in 2002 we had the set aside program, the
20	voluntary program and the U.S. produced a significantly
21	lower quantity of alpha than they had the prior year by
22	the tune of about 500,000 kilos of alpha of what was
23	actually got what was marketable. We saw a
24	tremendous drop of prices down into the \$22 and even
25	probably lower in some cases prices. This year, my
	York Stenographic Services, Inc.

1	figures are indicating an anticipated crop of 2.5
2	million kilos of alpha and prices have already moved
3	into the \$40 plus area. What it will be three to five
4	months from now is really anybody's guess. You can make
5	a case that it may be somewhat higher than that and
6	maybe it will be lower. I don't know. But the fact is
7	we've already seen a significant improvement in price
8	with this tremendous reduction, both in the U.S. But if
9	you recall the German graph had a tremendous hole in
10	total alpha production as well. So I think that's
11	actually what the next slide is. The next slide
12	actually is world high alpha production. And I don't
13	recall if this is just the German and U.S. together or
14	if it is in fact all the high alpha production. But if
15	it's German and U.S., which is what I think it is,
16	that's the bulk of it any way, 90 percent. But you can
17	you see typically the same thing. And so what I've
18	tried to do with this is following price action. Try to
19	get a feel for what the overall quantity of alpha that's
20	marketable between Germany and the U.S. at the
21	profitable level. And you can see that together with
22	Germany in 2001, we produced 4.9 million kilos of alpha
23	from this class of varieties at the farm level. And
24	this year I'm projecting that will be about 3.3 million
25	kilos of alpha. I've also tried to track market share
	York Stenographic Services, Inc.

of this class of varieties that competes directly
against each other. And basically what I've done is
just take the alpha production of the various countries,
again of varieties over 10 percent and looked at it.
And it's really pretty amazing to me. In 1994, the
American farmers enjoyed a 75 percent of the total
production of these varieties. The Germans, the English
and the Australian/New Zealand growers each had just
under 10 percent. The German production increased
rapidly with Magnum. And we see the decline of the
Australia/New Zealand production as a percentage of the
total as well as the U.K. We can see this year that
even though the Americans produced a smaller crop, the
devastating crop in Germany actually puts us in a little
bit stronger market share position than what we had
certainly last year. What's interesting about this
graph when I really started thinking about it, however,
was this is market share as it would relate to total
production by the farms. But in fact, the U.S. farmers,
the American farmers didn't sell all of their 2000 crop
into the market place. They didn't sell all their 2001
crop and they didn't sell all their 2002 crop. So in
fact, while we have this share of the overall
production, to say we have that share of that overall
market wouldn't be true because we haven't actually solo
York Stenographic Services, Inc.

1	it it would be hard to make a case that we had part of
2	that market. So that next slide, I did a theoretical
3	market share I think there we go theoretical
4	market share that if the Americans had sold all of their
5	alpha, okay, and what I've done is taken off the amount
6	of alpha that the industry tends to think was in
7	inventory, which was approximately a million kilos of
8	alpha. And that comes from various sources and there's
9	no way of really pinning it down, but that's the general
10	feeling. But if I took off the 100,000 of extra in 2001
11	that wasn't sold and the 600,000 here and so forth and
12	then if the Germans would have produced a normal crop
13	from their acreage, we can see that in fact the American
14	percentage of the world market for this class of
15	varieties would have continued to fall and the Germans
16	would have continued to gain ground. Any way, that's
17	those slides. Moving on, the point of that section of
18	my presentation was to point out that one, yes, we are
19	in a competitive environment with the Germans. We have
20	lost market share over the last 10 years. We enjoyed a
21	super share of the market, I guess would be one way of
22	phrasing it, in the early '90's through to the mid-
23	'90's. But in fact, the level of production of U.S.
24	alpha has a significant impact on world prices. It
25	would appear that way from the data that I've submitted.
	York Stenographic Services, Inc.

1	Moving on to the second reason for a Hop Marketing Order
2	would be the extremely inelastic demand for hops in
3	general. And I feel a little it's a little difficult
4	for me to put up a graph like this with two doctors,
5	PhD's, in economics here and begin to try to explain
6	this. But anybody in the audience or that has taken any
7	economics classes even at a low level remembers seeing a
8	similar graph that depicts demand and supply and the
9	impact of increasing or decreasing supply on price.
10	There's a quote here from Robert Shank, a professor of
11	economics at St. Joseph's College in Indiana and the
12	quote reads, "If American farmers all have excellent
13	harvests, they may have a very poor year financially.
14	They would have been better off if they all have
15	mediocre harvests." And essentially what he's saying
16	along with the graph of inelastic demand is that as
17	price or as supply increases, price many times will
18	decrease at a greater rate than the increase in supply.
19	And I think it's interesting in hops because my personal
20	opinion and I don't go through, you know there's a
21	way of calculating I think Dr. Folwell will do it
22	next week you know the demand the elasticity
23	coefficient of demand for hops and so forth and our
24	esteemed professors here would have a better would be
25	able to explain that better than I would. But just
	York Stenographic Services, Inc.

1	looking at it from a practical sense and from a dumb
2	farmer's sense, to me it becomes pretty simple to find
3	out for, in the case of hops, if the demand for hops is
4	in fact inelastic by just asking an simple question.
5	And the question that I think could be posed is if the
6	price of alpha declines, the brewers, who are the
7	consumers, increase their hopping rates. I think that's
8	very critical because that would prove, in fact if it
9	were true, that there was elasticity of demand for hops.
.0	Not
. 1	***
12	[Off the record.]
13	[On the record.]
14	***
15	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: We're back on
16	record at 4:39. Mr. Smith, would you just repeat what
17	you had just said when we had to change the tape.
18	MR. SMITH: Well, again, trying to get away
19	from the complexities of elasticity coefficients and so
20	forth, I pose a simple question that if the price of
21	alpha declines do brewers increase their hopping rates,
22	brewers being the consumers of the product. And the
23	question is important that not do brewers purchase
24	additional hops for inventory, but do they increase
25	their hopping rates. And the answer to that question is
	York Stenographic Services, Inc.
	34 North George St., York, PA 17401 - (717) 854-0077

1	no. And I think there's brewers in the audience that
2	could affirm this. There's a couple of reasons why they
3	don't increase their usage. One, hops have such a
4	minimal impact on the per unit costs of the beer that it
5	isn't an economic issue significant economic issue if
6	hops increase in price or decrease in price. But
7	secondly, the flavor profile of their beers are made up
8	under by a specific formula. Okay. And they're
9	going to use so many bittering units for a specific beer
10	because they have a certain taste profile that they want
11	to maintain. And so to increase or decrease their
12	hopping rates based on price is just something that
13	doesn't happen. That, to me, right there tells me again
14	as a dumb farmer that the demand for hops is very
15	inelastic and I see that in the market place. We see it
16	just in the graphs that I showed earlier, as production
17	increases above that which is demanded, we see a
18	significant fall in prices. And conversely, this year
19	is a perfect example of that, as supply comes back into
20	balance with demand, we'll see an increase in prices.
21	So reasons third reason for a Hop Marketing Order is
22	what I call a lack of a competitive market. Over the
23	last 10 years we've seen some terrific changes in and
24	actually over the last 20 years to be more accurate
25	terrific changes in the hop market. 20 years ago
	York Stenographic Services, Inc.

growers sold directly to brewers but not a significant
degree American farmers sold a percentage of their
production directly to brewers. But again, it was not
very much and it was just a few growers who were
involved. In the mid-1960's excuse me the mid-
1980's, a major U.S. brewer came into the market for
hops direct and began to purchase those directly from
farmers. Subsequent to that decision, another major
U.S. brewer came into the market and began purchase a
percentage of their hops directly from farmers. So that
was one of the changes that we saw. And both of those
direct purchase programs still exist today. By the same
token, we had, as growers, multiple dealers, brokers,
processors, whatever term you want to use, that we could
access to sell our hops. And I want to pick a number
and I don't have it now specifically but seven or
eight different dealers we in place. So I'll talk about
that further. I want to go through first the definition
of a market and again it's pretty rudimentary. But a
market essentially is an organized exchange of
commodities between buyers and sellers within a specific
geographic area and during a given period of time.
Markets are the exchange between buyers who want a good
obviously the demand side of the market and the
sellers who have it, the supply side of the market. In
York Stenographic Services, Inc.

1	essence, a buyer exchanges money for a good while a
2	seller gives up a good and receives money. From a
3	marketing context, in order to be a market, the
4	following conditions must exist; the target consumers
5	must have the ability to purchase the goods or services.
6	They must have a need or desire to purchase. The target
7	group must be willing to exchange something of value for
8	the product. And finally, they must have authority to
9	make a purchase. If these variables are present, a
10	market exhibits. However, the definition of a
11	competitive market is a market with a large number of
12	buyers and a large number of sellers such that no single
13	buyer or seller is able to influence the price or any
14	other aspect of the market, that nobody has any
15	significant I interjected significant any market
16	control. Market control is essentially the ability of
17	buyers or sellers to exert influence over the price or
18	quantity of a good, service or commodity exchanged in a
19	market. Market control depends on the number of
20	competitors. If a market has a relatively few buyers
21	but many sellers, then the buyers tend to have
22	relatively more market control than the sellers. The
23	converse occurs if there are many buyers, but relatively
24	few sellers. If the market is controlled in the supply
25	side by one seller, we have a monopoly. If it is
	York Stenographic Services, Inc.

```
1
       controlled in the demand side by one buyer, we have a
       monopsony. Most markets are subject to come degree of
2
3
       control. When we go back and look at the hops that are
       produced in the United States -- and this is the larger
4
       class of varieties -- and I'm going to -- I'm sorry.
5
       apologize. This isn't really the slide that I wanted to
6
       utilize. I want to go back up a ways.
                                                Excuse me.
       There we go. Sorry. We look at the distribution of the
8
       hop varieties. And I've been talking, as you recall,
9
       mainly in these varieties of over 10 percent.
10
       looking at the distribution of all the varieties, it's
11
       fairly interesting when you look at it from a
12
       competitive market standpoint. The Willamette's are
13
       purchased primarily by -- there's only one buyer.
14
       They're a major U.S. brewer and they purchase the
15
       majority -- the vast majority of these hops directly
16
        from farmers. Some are purchased through the dealer
17
        network. But the market is -- and I'm going to venture
18
        a guess here -- 95 percent of these hops, 90 percent
19
        possibly of these hops are going to this particular
20
        brewer or possibly another -- excuse me -- foreign
21
        brewers or international brewers that brew this beer for
22
        -- the same beer for the same brewer. I know that
23
        wasn't clear so I'm not even going to try to clean it
24
        up. Cascade -- also a percentage of the Cascade are
25
                          York Stenographic Services, Inc.
```

purchased by this brewer as well. The Perle, primarily
only one brewer has been purchasing those as well. This
other aroma category is primarily what the craft brewing
industry is utilizing. They use these other varieties
as well, but I mean a big percentage of them are coming
out of this three percent area there. The point being
that you could make a case that in the aroma market is
not a competitive market necessarily. I'm not saying
that anybody has exerted undue influence on it. I'm
just saying that because of the lack of purchasers, it's
an uncompetitive market. When we look at the 75 percent
of the other hops that are in the high alpha category,
again, it's interesting to note from a competitive
market standpoint what are the outlets for growers for
these hops. I mean who can they sell them to. About 25
to 30 percent of the volume of these hops is run through
a private company that's owned by growers but it's
really somewhat closed to outside growers. The bulk of
the product that's delivered to that group is delivered
by the owners of the company. And so for a grower
third party grower off the street to deliver any of
these varieties to that company, I'm not going to say
it's impossible but it doesn't happen on a regular
basis, okay, and there's no guarantee that it can happen
on a regular basis. So that takes care of about 25 to
York Stenographic Services, Inc.

1	30 percent of these block of hops. So the balance 70
2	to 75 percent of those hops for the growers have to go
3	through two merchants. They are companies that also
4	happen to be growers but they have storage facilities,
5	processing facilities, marketing infrastructure and so
6	forth. But those are the only outlets. So again, you
7	can make a case that in all of the U.S. varieties or the
8	bulk of the U.S. varieties today, the growers are faced
9	with an uncompetitive market situation. Okay. And that
0	differs significantly from the market as it existed 20
11	years ago in 1983, 1984, 1985 and those areas when we
12	had multiple buyers in the forms of multiple dealers and
13	we also that was before we had any direct contact or
14	direct contracts with domestic brewers. So I'll run
15	back now back to where we were if we can.
16	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Let me interject
17	for just a moment, Mr. Smith. I do want us to close
18	about 5:00 p.m. today and I want to ask Mr. Monahan if
19	you have any copies of exhibits that you want to
20	distribute before we disperse tonight?
21	MR. MONAHAN: Your Honor, I don't. I'm going
22	to making those copies at the conclusion of today's
23	hearing and I'll have them before we convene in the
24	morning.
25	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Okay. Mr.
	York Stenographic Services, Inc.
	34 North George St., York, PA 17401 - (717) 854-0077

```
1
       Moody, I'll get you in just a moment. Court reporter,
2
       I'd ask you not to ship any tapes tonight because if
       you'll wait until you can send them with copies of
3
       statements as we go, I really think it will help the
4
       typist. Okay. Mr. Moody, your...
5
                 MR. MOODY:
                                Just a point, Your Honor, and
6
       it's really, I suppose, up to Brendan, that we'd
7
8
       certainly be willing to go passed five so we can move
       things along. We'd be willing to go as late as the
9
       witness would care to go and Your Honor would care to
10
11
       go.
                                 I defer to Your Honor.
                 MR. MONAHAN:
12
                 ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE:
                                              All right. I
13
       would like to do that on any night other than tonight,
14
       the first night, because we did say in the notice that
15
       we would quit at 5:00 and because there's a lot of
16
17
       copying to be done -- this was our maiden voyage. It's
        kind of a shakedown cruise. And so I would appreciate
18
       the ability to work late on another night -- other
19
       nights other than tonight. All right. Then Mr. Smith,
20
       you have until 5:00. You may resume.
21
                                 We didn't get charged with that
22
                  MR. SMITH:
        time right there. Did we?
23
24
                  ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE:
                                                Probably so.
        I'm sorry. Go ahead.
25
```

York Stenographic Services, Inc. 34 North George St., York, PA 17401 - (717) 854-0077

1	MR. SMITH: Okay. Well, the next question
2	that I pose is will a Hop Marketing Order be effective
3	in stabilizing the market for growers. Whether or not a
4	future one would be I'm not sure. The only one I have
5	any familiarity with is the previous order. And I've
6	enjoyed production in the previous order from 1975,
7	which is when I came in actually it was 1974 when I
8	came into the industry until the order was terminated in
9	the mid-1980's. So this is a graph of the U.S. season
10	average price from 1950 through the year 2000. And what
11	I've done is segment out the season average price, both
12	pre, post and during the last Hop Marketing Order. Pre-
13	Hop Marketing Order, this is what the prices looked like
14	from 1950 through 1965. Beginning in 1966, we had a
15	the marketing order came into effect and was in effect
16	until 1983 through the 1983 crop. And we can see that
17	the marketing order during the period of the
18	marketing order the season average price increased every
19	year. We do see kind of an aberration in the latter
20	part of the previous hop marketing order. The first 14
21	years the price increases were fairly moderate but
22	steady. In 1980, we saw a terrific jump in prices
23	followed significantly higher prices relatively speaking
24	in the early '80's. And this was due primarily to the
25	fact that in 1979 the Germans had a very poor crop. And
	York Stenographic Services, Inc.

1	while we didn't see a significant jump in pricing in
2	1979 on an average basis, we did in 1980. And in 1980,
3	the Germans followed this '79 crop with another very
4	poor crop. But another thing that was interesting about
5	this period of time when you talk about stability of
6	prices, and growers who operated under this will
7	remember, that in any given year, as we came into the
8	marketing season, okay, and we did that when we talk
9	about the marketing season, the hop administrative
10	committee met in January of each year to review the
11	production and to set the saleable percentage for the
12	ensuing year. And I served as an alternate to the
13	gentleman on my right, Mr. Desserault, as an HAC member
14	for seven or eight years any way. And one of the things
15	that was very that lent to the stability of the
16	pricing was that about 90 percent or more of our crop
17	was sold on contract for the ensuing crop year in
18	January. So as we went into let's say January of 1977,
19	for example, 90 percent or more of the crop for the
20	following crop year was already sold. And so the
21	fluctuations in production from year to year were only
22	impacting about 10 percent of the crop, that portion of
23	the crop that wasn't sold. So that's why even though in
24	'79 there was this tremendous shortage in Germany,
25	because the bulk of the crop was sold on contract, the
	York Stenographic Services, Inc.

1	overall season average price didn't jump much. However,
2	the next year we saw contracts following the '79 crop
3	failure in Germany, contracts in 1980 were significantly
4	higher, those portions that hadn't already been previous
5	sold. And then following the 1980 crop disaster in
6	Germany we had prices, contracts that growers in this
7	room, their families, I entered into, at high prices,
8	significantly higher than the cost of production. Any
9	way, that's kind of a depiction of the pricing
10	average pricing during the Hop Marketing Order. And I
11	think you would have to term that as being fairly
12	stable, at least for the bulk of that time period. And
13	then since the Hop Marketing Order has gone out the
14	charts looks average price chart looks very similar
15	to the one prior to the Hop Marketing Order. So
16	essentially what it tells me is that a Hop Marketing
17	Order can have it's possible to have a stabilizing
18	influence on price. And without a Hop Marketing Order
19	certainly volatility of price is essentially going to be
20	the name of the game. At least that's the experience
21	that we have. And if you were to take that chart from
22	1950 and run it back to 1860 you would see the exact
23	same thing, terrific fluctuations in price over a period
24	of time. And so essentially I think the question
25	becomes to participants in the industry as the mull over
	York Stepographic Services, Inc.

```
1
       the opportunity to enter back into a marketing order is
2
       how is their own personal business model best suited.
       Is it best suited in a stable pricing environment or is
3
       it best suited in a volatile pricing environment? And
5
       then make a case that there are companies in this
       industry that actually can profit from volatility in
6
       price. Okay. I would also put forth I don't think it's
7
8
       growers that can profit significantly from it, but there
9
       are participants in the industry who can profit from
10
       volatility in price. Finally, not that it's all bad.
       We've seen from the data today that the U.S. grower has
11
12
       lost a significant percentage of market share in high
13
       alpha hops, but we still maintain some advantages over
14
       our competitors in Germany and I think those need to be
       pointed out. One, we have higher alpha production on a
15
       per acre basis or a per unit of land basis,
16
17
        significantly higher than the German farmer.
        we have relatively speaking a favorable exchange rate.
18
        We've suffered over the last couple of years with a very
19
        strong dollar. And that's weakened appreciably in the
20
        recent year and a half. And that's helping the U.S.
21
        grower. We have a very good processing and sales
22
        infrastructure and we have consistent production. What
23
        happened in Germany this year does not happen in the
24
25
        United States. Total crop failures are just not part of
                         York Stenographic Services, Inc.
```

the U.S. producers' situation and you can see that in
the next graph. We can the top line is the total
alpha production per excuse me that's per acre of
the Tomahawk, Columbus, Tomahawk, Zeus. And again,
powdery mildew, when we were first when we first were
confronted with powdery mildew growers really didn't
know how to handle it and we were utilizing the wrong
materials and they had a negative impact on production.
What you can see is in the year 2000, 2001, 2002, 2003
the growers have kind of gotten back on top of their
control of powdery mildew. And this consistency of
production over here that we saw prior to powdery mildew
appears to be coming back later in the timeframe. We've
got a U.S. Warrior, U.S. Millennium producing
significantly more alpha than the German Magnum, for
example. So that affords the U.S. grower an advantage
over his German counter part. And when we look at
exchange rates on a long-term basis we can see and
what I've done here is I've got a chart going back to
and I don't know what happened to the years but this
goes back to 1973. I think I did 30 years. And we can
see that over that period of time that the U.S. dollar
in relationship to the German Deutchmark has
consistently declined. And of course, in January of
2002, the Deutchmark no longer exists due to the Euro.
York Stenographic Services, Inc.

1	But I've gone ahead and converted the current Euro
2	exchange rates since 2002 to the present day at the
3	fixed exchange rate between the Euro and the DM to get a
4	depiction of what the DM actually would be. And we can
5	see that there's probably, from a statistical
6	standpoint, some prospect that the exchange rate with
7	the Deutchmark or with the Euro would continue to afford
8	some advantages for growers. For the U.S. grower, we're
9	above the long-term trend line and you can make a case
10	that at some point we may dip down below that again. Of
11	course, if I could do that you know, if I could tell
12	you when that was going to be and how much that was
13	going to be I wouldn't have to worry about farming hops.
14	But any way, that's so I think there are some
15	advantages still for U.S. growers. We're not going to
16	lose all of our market share. We're going to be able to
17	maintain some level of market share and probably for
18	some time to come. And actually that ends my
19	presentation.
20	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: High quality and
21	I appreciate it. Thank you very much, Mr. Smith.
22	MR. SMITH: And Your Honor, I hesitate to
23	do this, but I will if it helps. I would be more than
24	happy to donate this Power Book G4 into the record.
25	That way you would have it available to you. The USDA
	York Stenographic Services, Inc.

```
would. Anybody else would. And as long as Mr. Roy
1
2
       doesn't object, because it's his computer, it's yours.
3
                  ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE:
                                                 Let me ask you.
       On the reproductions, will they be in color as the
5
       slides were?
                  MR. SMITH:
                                 We will.
                  ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE:
7
                                                 Okay.
8
                  MR. SMITH:
                                 We'll do that.
9
                  ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE:
                                                 That's good.
10
       Now, you did go very quickly and I think those people
       who are going over the record will be able to figure out
11
       what slide you were on and trace your points. When we
12
13
       have cross-examination on this tomorrow, we may need a
       little more -- if you'll bring again your pointer, which
14
       will be very helpful -- even while they're cross-
15
       examining you, we may need a little more detail as to
16
       what you're pointing at needs to be spoken into the
17
        record. For example, if you're pointing at a price of
18
        $22, then as you point to it you need to say this price
19
20
        of $22. If you're pointing to a year of 1964, even
        though we can all tell that's what you're referring to,
21
22
        you may need to identify it in words even though it will
        slow you down.
23
                  MR. SMITH:
                                  I'll do my best but you'll
24
        probably have to remind me.
25
                          York Stenographic Services, Inc.
```

York Stenographic Services, Inc. 34 North George St., York, PA 17401 - (717) 854-0077

1	ADMINISTRATIVE DAW CODGE. All light. Very
2	good. All right. Then I'd like you all to consider
3	whether you can go late tomorrow. If there are
4	objections to that, I'll honor those objections. We did
5	say we would stop at 5:00. And also consider whether
6	you can go late the next day, Friday. And I'll talk to
7	you all about that when we begin tomorrow. So we'll see
8	you at 8:30 tomorrow morning. This concludes our record
9	at this time. Thank you. We're off record at 5:04 p.m.
10	***
11	[End of Proceedings]

York Stenographic Services, Inc. 34 North George St., York, PA 17401 - (717) 854-0077

CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER, TRANSCRIBER AND PROOFREADER 1 2 3 HOPS PRODUCERS FOR WASHINGTON, OREGON, IDAHO 4 IN RE: 5 AND CALIFORNIA 6 7 Portland, Oregon HELD AT: 8 9 October 15, 2003 DATE: 10 11 We, the undersigned, do hereby certify that the foregoing pages, numbered 1 through 230, inclusive, are 12 the true, accurate and complete transcript prepared from 13 14 the reporting by the reporter in attendance at the above identified hearing, in accordance with applicable 15 provisions of the current USDA contract, and have 16 verified the accuracy of the transcript by (1) comparing 17 18 the typewritten transcript against the reporting or recording accomplished at the hearings, and (2) 19 20 comparing the final proofed typewritten transcript against the reporting or recording accomplished at the 21 22 hearing. 23 24 Date: 25 Marisa G. Baublitz, Træhscriber 26 27 York Stenographic Services, Inc. 28 29 Date: 30 Proofreader Sarah Mowrer, 31 York Stenographic Services, Inc. 32 33 34 Date: 35 Mark Frethem, Reporter 36

37

38

York Stenographic Services, Inc. 34 North George St., York, PA 17401 - (717) 854-0077

York Stenographic Services, Inc.